

THE

AMERICAN

Be

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. CCXXXVIII. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XX.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1895.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

PHILADELPHIA:
CHARLES A. HARDY,
PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1895,

BY

CHARLES A. HARDY.

70752

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| JOHN BAPTIST DE ROSSI. By <i>Rev. T. J. Shahan, D.D.</i> , | 1 |
| De Rossi's eminence in his chosen work, 1; His early life, 2; His father's opposition to his vocation as an antiquarian, 3; A familiar figure in the great archives and libraries of Europe, 4; Splendid celebration of his sixtieth birthday, 5; His own joy at the good he had done, 6; The vast range of his acquirements, 7; The passion for inscriptions, 8; An invaluable link in the science of Christian epigraphy, 9; De Rossi's name overshadows those of all his predecessors, 10; Qualities of the man that greatly aided him in his work, 11; His "Inscriptiones Christianæ," 12; His knowledge of sources and the superiority of his system, 14; Chronology and geology as aids to his work, 15; Relics of the mediæval Irish missionaries, 17; De Rossi's researches in the Roman Catacombs, 19; Simplicity of his methods, 20; The two lines on which he conducted his investigations, 22; Documents that aided him, 23; Emptying the ancient historic crypts, 24; Reconstructing the under-world of Christian Rome, 25; The great storehouse of information he has left, 27; An aid even to the theologian, 28; De Rossi's work in cataloguing the Vatican archives, 29; The wide field covered by his minor writings, 30; He had also a strong talent for organizing, 31; Saving Christian monuments from destruction, 32; How to fitly judge of him as a savant, 33; Distinguished for modesty as well as scientific probity, 34; Harmony between natural aspirations and Catholic doctrine, 36. | |
| THE CENTENARY OF MAYNOOTH COLLEGE. By <i>Rev. J. F. Hogan, D.D.</i> , | 37 |
| A century's change in Catholic Ireland, 37; Working of the penal laws in the eighteenth century, 38; Their first relaxation, 39; Irish seminarians abroad, 40; The new departure of 1795—a national seminary provided for, 41; Beginning of the great institution at Maynooth—its first president, 42; Close of Dr. Hussey's career, 44; Other members of the faculty, 45; From a small beginning has come a great development, 46; The institution attacked by the enemies of Catholicism, 47; Choice specimens of bigotry, 48; Some of the great professors in the college, 50; Dr. Russell and Dr. Murray contrasted, 51; Dr. Murray as a controversialist, 52; As a poet, 53; Many other names that might be dwelt upon, 54. | |
| THE GRANDEUR OF ANCIENT ROME—A PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL. By <i>Rt. Rev. Robert Seton, D.D.</i> , | 55 |
| Almost the only ancient history worth knowing is that of Rome, 55; Why Roman conquests are justified politically and philosophically, 56; Essential points of difference between Roman and other civilizations, 57; The position of women as the test of a nation's greatness, 59; Roman tributes to virginity and chastity, 60; The Romans also distinguished for their patriotism, 61; The ancient Roman law close akin to that of Moses, 63; In Pagan Rome the way was prepared for Christianity, 64; Human nature inadequate without Christianity, 65. | |
| THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL EXHIBIT AT THE COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION. By <i>Gen. John Eaton, Ph.D., LL.D.</i> , | 66 |
| One of the great surprises at the World's Fair in Chicago, 66; A surprise especially for those who think ill of the Church, 67; The exhibit was, indeed, phenomenal and fully served its purpose, 68; Statistics of the great collection, 69; All the work was not, of course, of uniform merit, 70; Pertinent questions on the various studies, 71; Impressions made to remain for a lifetime, 73; Effect of the exhibit on the various orders of teachers, 75; Reformatory and industrial school work, 76; Some prominent colleges, 77; Catholic education day at the Fair, 78; The speakers insisted on religious education, 79; How this exhibit was brought about, 81. | |
| THE RECENT DECREES ON CHURCH MUSIC. By <i>Rev. Hugh T. Henry</i> , | 82 |
| Two important documents that recently emanated from the Congregation of Rites, 82; The frequent discussion of music reform in the Church, 83; The general spirit of the new regulation and decree, 85; With what the decree is concerned, 86; The spirit of liturgical reform was abroad, 89; Need felt for cheaper editions of books of liturgy, 90; The unification of chant aimed at by Pope Pius IX., 91; Why the Holy See insists on a certain edition, 92; The decree of April 10, 1883, 93; The regulation, 95; A similar set of rules previously issued, 97; Of what the regulation consists, 98; The poles of musical appreciation, 99; Limits to condescension to popular tastes, 100; Status given to the Gregorian chant by the regulation, 101; Summary of the theory regarding it, 102; Praise for the Palastrinesque style, 103; What is said of "chromatic music," 104; Theatrical character of certain music, 105; Provisions of various articles of the regulation, 106; For the future improvement of sacred music schools, 108; A constant provision for reducing the regulation to practice, 109; Instructions to promote the study of sacred music and reform abuses, 110. | |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATION. By <i>Rev. Thomas Bouquillon, D.D.</i> , | 112 |
| The two official documents bearing on the subject, 112; Legations in general, 113; Legations to particular churches, 114; The legates represent the person of the Sovereign Pontiff, 116; Delegations have existed since the first centuries of Christianity, 117; Decline of the vicariates, 118; Institution of delegations essential, 119; Delegations sent to civil powers, 120; This Papal right does not assume the union of Church and State, 121; A right inherent in the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, 122; The first representatives sent by the Holy See to civil powers, 124; Excellent results attained by Papal representation to secular governments, 125; The American delegation, 126; It is ecclesiastical, not diplomatic, 127; It will make a more perfect unity within the American Church, 128; The duty of Catholics to give aid to the Papal delegate, 129; The qualities required in the ecclesiastical diplomat, 130. | |
| THE RELATIONS OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY. By <i>Rev. E. A. Pace, D.D.</i> , | 131 |
| Co-operation by which the various sciences are mutually helpful, 131; As to whether a particular science may employ a particular method, 132; A proper acquaintance with methods necessary, 133; The difficulty of marking the limits of psychology, 134; Psychology's vicissitudes, 135; Divergence of views regarding the scope of psychology, 136; An unsatisfactory definition, 137; Elasticity of the term "psychology," 138; An excursion into metaphysics, 139; An instructive diversity of opinion, 140; Facts show a condition fulfilled, 141; A science not to be condemned on account of the views of individual thinkers, 142; Absence of harmony in regard to this question, 143; The situation as shown by psychological literature, 144; Neutral position of experimental psychology, 145; A distinction also as to the knowledge of acts, 146; Some method must be followed to gain a scientific knowledge of any mental activity, 147; What the critics tell us, 148; The result of varying the conditions of mental activity, 149; How our conduct affects our appreciation of time, 150; Our mental processes have a duration, 151; The intensity of sensations, 152; Physiology and psychology in contact at many points, 153; Illustrations from various fields of science, 155; The practical bearings of experimental psychology, 156; Catholic philosophers should not be apathetic regarding it, 158; The results of experiment susceptible of philosophic interpretation, 159; Encouraging the spirit of research among Catholics, 160; A revolution of opinion that is not without precedent, 161. | |
| A NEGATIVE VIEW OF THE ENCYCLICAL "PROVIDENTISSIMUS DEUS." By <i>Rev. A. J. Maas, S.J.</i> , | 162 |
| Adverse views of negatives, 162; The encyclical is not directly dogmatic, 163; Not intended to be an <i>ex-cathedra</i> utterance, 165; Does not teach verbal inspiration, 166; Teaching of the Fathers regarding the Holy Scriptures, 168; The encyclical does not add to the Tridentine and the Vatican decrees, 170; Various interpretations of the word "parts" given by Catholic theologians, 172; The encyclical does not ascribe absolute truth to the whole Bible, 173; Less important negatives in the encyclical, 175. | |
| THE TREASURES OF THE CHURCH. By <i>Rev. William Barry, D.D.</i> , | 176 |
| Why everything in Europe seems to us so tinged with sadness, 176; A different condition in America, 177; Wide-spread ravages of materialism, 178; No wonder the contemplative are struck with sadness, 179; Not to lose religion is the supreme problem, 180; The state of things during the past century is not without precedent, 181; The Catholic idea of worship, 182; A great change that is opening before us, 183; The Catholic ritual aims at something far beyond poetry, 184; An important method of recommending our faith, 185; How we should present our religious credentials, 186; Christianity did not come into the world as an abstract principle, 187; The true starting point of religious discussion, 188; The extremes of Pharisaic ritualism and rationalism, 189; We should even aim to make the Catholic Church its own evidence, 190; Why the task of Catholicism should be more hopeful in America, 192. | |
| SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. Thomas J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> , | 194 |
| Essential oils—their manufacture, properties and uses, 194; Their origin, 196; How they are extracted, 197; Processes of extraction and expression, 198; Process of distillation, 200; Of solution, 201; Of maceration, 202; Of absorption, 203; Animal perfumes, 205; A few of the essential oils and their properties, 208. | |
| THE CORRELATION OF ORDER AND JURISDICTION. By <i>A. F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)</i> , | 225 |
| Anglican bewilderment as to jurisdiction, 225; The dual nature of spiritual power, 226; The constituents of a competent authority, 227; The doctrine and the fact of Papal jurisdiction in England, 229; Considerations on order, 230; Intimate relations of jurisdiction and order, 233; History of an Anglican anomaly, 234; The first really Anglican prelate, 235; Hazards involved in the Anglican theory of priesthood, 237. | |
| INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES (THIRD ARTICLE). By <i>Richard R. Elliott</i> , | 238 |
| Indian tribes of New England, 238; Catholic missionary efforts among the Hurons and the Iroquois, 239; John Eliot and others among the New England Indians, 240; Fate of these aborigines, 241; English prints of American Indian books, 242; Eliot's editions of the Scriptures for the Indians, 243; His great industry, 246; Character of existing copies of Indian works, 247; Other books prepared by Eliot, 248; The Indians of Pennsylvania, 250; Mather's works, 251; Thomas' account of Pennsylvania and other books, 252; The Mohegan or Stockbridge Indians, 253; | |

Table of Contents.

V

PAGE

The aborigines of New Jersey, etc., 255; Zeisberger's books in the Delaware language, 256; General remarks on New England Indian literature, 257; Catholic missions among the Indians, 259; Catholic Iroquoians living on Canadian soil, 260; Abenakis and Algonquins, 261; Aim of the French Jesuit missionaries, 262; Present condition of the Canadian Indians, 263; The United States might learn a lesson from Canada, 264.

INDIFFERENTISM. By *Rev. Charles Coupe, S.J.*, 266

Protestant England once in earnest as well as in error, 266; Difference between indifferentism and atheism, 267; The present spirit in non-Catholic religion is that of lawless liberalism, 268; The only issue and outcome of Protestantism, 269; The parent of indifferentism, 270; Why the Bible can never be an infallible rule of faith, 271; The only certain canon of Scripture is that fixed by the authority of the Church, 273; Protestants themselves acknowledge the insufficiency of the Bible, 274; The certainty of faith an intellectual and objective certainty, 275; Summary of the arguments so far presented, 276; Protestant apologists recognize that faith is an impossibility for them, 278; Protestantism leads not only to indifferentism, but to rationalism, 279; Indifferentism is against reason, 281; The very idea of God precludes indifferentism, 283; Indifferentism also against revelation, 285; Difficult position of the indifferentist as a sinner, 287.

MARYLAND OR RHODE ISLAND—LORD BALTIMORE OR ROGER WILLIAMS—WHICH WAS FIRST? By *Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.*, 289

The fundamental principle involved in Maryland toleration, 289; The date of the Rhode Island toleration compact, 290; Official oaths and the religious liberty act in Maryland, 291; Text of the Maryland toleration act, 292; What the law and the practice were in Maryland prior to 1648, 295; Position of the first Lord Baltimore, 296; His colony an asylum for persecuted fellow-Catholics, 298; Not simply toleration, but equality, his rule, 299; His sacrifices and sufferings in the cause of religious liberty, 300; Character of the Maryland charter, 302; Organization of the new colony, 303; Lord Baltimore's instructions to his Lieutenant-Governor, 304; Roger Williams, then, is ante-dated, 305; Evidence of leading historians, 307; Testimony borne by even Protestantized Maryland, 308; And the Jesuits were Lord Baltimore's advisers, 309; What Bancroft says, 310; Maryland, then, has two years' precedence over Rhode Island, 311.

THE VICAR GENERAL. By *Rev. G. Peries, D.D.*, 313

Who are understood by "Vicars," 313; Official assistants to bishops, as well in the early Western as in the Eastern Church, 314; Action of the Fourth Lateran Council, 315; Archdeacons supplanted by Vicars-General in the thirteenth century, 317; Extension of the Vicar-General's authority, 319; Voluntary and contentious jurisdiction, 320; The number of Vicars-General in a diocese, 321; A peculiar state of affairs under the old regime in France, 322; Plurality of Vicars-General admitted now in some countries, 324; When there are more than one, they are naturally independent of each other, 325; No special formula required for a Vicar-General's appointment, 326.

GLADSTONE'S HORACE. By *Rev. H. T. Henry*, 327

Quests of Englishmen in the realms of fact and fancy, 327; English names famous in Horatian literature, 328; Something better than a mere artist required in a proper interpreter of Horace, 329; The benefit of a multiplicity of translations, 330; Mr. Gladstone's diversity of rhythmic ministration, 331; Characteristics of the versions of Francis and Bulwer, 333; The question of imitating the Horatian metre and stanza, 334; The sense and point of the author should at least be preserved, 336; To what extent Mr. Gladstone has succeeded, 337; Gladstone and Sir Theodore Martin, 338; One of Gladstone's notable successes, 340; Only one acquainted with the original can fully enjoy a translation of Horace, 341; Pleasure of a version which simply translates, 342; Only to a Horatian audience can a translation of Horace appeal successfully, 344.

THE ENCYCLICAL "LONGINQUA" (Latin text). By *His Holiness Pope Leo XIII.* 346

TRANSLATION OF THE ENCYCLICAL "LONGINQUA," 357

LEO XIII. AND THE ENCYCLICAL "LONGINQUA." By *Rt. Rev. Mgr. Joseph Shroeder, D.D.*, 369

An object of study, as well as of gratitude, respect and admiration, 369; Role of the Papacy in Church and society, 370; The pontificate of Leo XIII., 372; Leo XIII. and America, 374; Reason for the Holy Father's predilection for our country, 377; Leo XIII. and Catholic America, 378; The Apostolic Delegation, 379; Faith and reason, 380; Church and State, 381; The social question, 384; Advocating the cause of the working classes, 386; The Catholic press, 387; The best means the editor has for doing the best service to religion and society, 388.

ITALY'S RECONCILIATION WITH THE HOLY SEE. By *Wilfred C. Robinson*, . . 389

A really valuable history of Pope Leo XIII., 389; Documents that glorify his pontificate, 390; The new Supreme Pontiff and the Kingdom of Italy, 391; The repeated rumors of reconciliation, 392; The Pope's ardent longing for this result, 393; The many infamies of the Italian government during Leo XIII.'s reign, 394; Intolerable position of the Pope in Rome, 395; The Revolution overreaching itself, 396; The Pope could have hastened the downfall of the Italian Kingdom, 397; A possible solution of the difficulty hinted at, 398.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| "QUID MIHI ET TIBI, MULIER?" By <i>Rev. A. E. Breen, D.D.</i> , | 399 |
| The long vexed passage, John ii., 4, 399; Superiority of Challoner's text, 400; Examination of the text in question, 401; Conclusion to be drawn from Christ's performing the miracle, 402. | |
| SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. T. J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> , | 404 |
| Petroleum—an historical sketch, 404; Table showing the yearly production, average price, and total value of oil, 1859-1893, 419; The world's production of petroleum, 420. | |
| THE RUSSIAN STATE CHURCH. By <i>Bryan J. Clinch</i> , | 449 |
| Russia and the Pope's appeal for Christian reunion, 449; A French writer's optimistic view, 450; Peculiar relations of Russia to the Catholic Church, 451; Origin of the Greek schism, 452; The conversion of Russia, 453; Religious affairs in Russia and its borderland since the Council of Florence, 454; Difficulties of Catholics under the Czar, 455; Points in the State Church opposed to the Catholic faith, 456; The question of absolute power, 457; Catholics under the present Czar, 458; No reason for expecting the immediate union of Russia with Rome, 459. | |
| PURE VS. DILUTED CATHOLICISM. By <i>Very Rev. A. F. Hewit, C.S.P.</i> , | 460 |
| Matthew Arnold and the "New Universal Church of the Future," 460; The utmost that the Roman Catholic Church can concede, 461; The definitions of the Church irreformable, 462; Whence springs the temptation to dilute Catholic doctrine, 463; What is necessary to preserve the Catholic doctrine in its genuine purity, 464; Theology of the right sort an imperative want of the intelligent laity, 466; Doctrine, considered as a truth, is immutable, 467; The recent action of the Holy See regarding the Eastern Churches, 468; Very little of a Protestant spirit among them, 469; Difficult position of certain Protestant clergymen, 470; Who can see what is to become of Protestantism? 471; Difficulties in the way of well-meaning non-Catholics, 472; The way to surmount the internal difficulty of ignorance, 473; The clergy as the upholders of the Catholic religion, 474; Calumnies against the Church and her agencies, 475; The work of exposing the lies about the Church, 476; Importance of Catholics leading virtuous and exemplary lives, 477; No indication of a general movement of a return to Catholicism, 478; The great obstacle in the way of this return, 479; Position of those who disbelieve in all religion, 480; And of unprejudiced outsiders, 481; The only possible union of all Christians is in the Catholic Church, 482; Even some of the discipline of the Church cannot be changed, 483; The three essential constituent principles of the Catholic religion, 484; The mission of the clergy, 485. | |
| ABOUT THE UTAH SAINTS. By <i>M. A. C.</i> | 486 |
| The Mormons and their capital, 486; Characteristics of Salt Lake City, 487; Original seclusion of the settlement 488; Opposition of the Latter-day Saints to every form of government but their own, 489; The polygamous feature of Mormonism, 490; Awful miseries of women in the Mormon valley, 491; Whence they were "gathered in," 492; Their preternatural ugliness, 493; Relations of Federal officials with the colony, 494; Brigham Young a declared enemy of education, 495; The songs of Mormonism, 496; The best antidote to Mormonism would be the spread of Catholic doctrine, 497; A great work begun in Utah by Catholic agencies, 498; Death and character of Brigham Young, 499; Irish in Utah, but not among the "Saints," 500. | |
| OLD TESTAMENT SUBJECTS IN EARLY CHRISTIAN ART. By <i>Rt. Rev. Robert Seton, D.D.</i> , | 501 |
| Religious truth the chief subject of early Christian art, 501; Scope of the subject of this paper, 502; The fall of our first parents, 503; Cain and Abel and Melchisedech, 504; Noë's ark and the barque of Peter, 505; Abraham and Isaac and the Good Shepherd, 506; Moses and Elias, 507; Christ and His Church, 508; The religious picture books of the Middle Ages, 509. | |
| GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS. By <i>Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D.</i> , | 510 |
| The Thirty Years' War the real end of the Middle Ages, 510; Character of the German empire in the sixteenth century, 511; Effects of the "Reformation" in Germany, 512; Alliances during the first period of the Thirty Years' War, 514; Gustavus Adolphus in the second period supported by France, 516; France's object was her own aggrandisement, 518; Secret of the successes of Gustavus Adolphus, 520; Richelieu alarmed at these successes, 521; The establishment of liberty in Germany not the Swedish monarch's aim, 522; His death followed by reverses for the Protestants, 523; Results of the peace of Westphalia, and the Pope's position, 525. | |
| THE OPENING OF A JUDICIAL INSTRUCTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATE DOCUMENT "CUM MAGNOPERE." By <i>Rev. G. Peries, D.D.</i> , | 528 |
| Origin of the new Discipline in regard to criminal cases, 528; A natural deduction from a provision of the Third Plenary Council, 529; The mode of originating the process itself, 530; The two phases of a disciplinary inquiry before the ecclesiastical courts, 532; The "inquisitio judicialis," 534; No proceedings can be taken unless the accused be <i>diffamatus</i> , 536; Exceptions, 538; The concealment of crime nowadays extremely difficult, 539; Frequent breaches in judicial theories, 540; Conclusions still open to discussion, 541; The elements making up a judicial instruction, 542. | |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| THE NEWLY DISCOVERED SYRIAC GOSPELS. By <i>Rev. A. J. Maas, S.J.</i> . . . | 543 |
| History of this discovery, 543; Description of the palimpsest, 544; The writing containing the gospel-text, 545; Peculiarities of the Syriac gospels, 546; Peculiar readings and Syriac variations, 547; The Sinaitic text represents a very early Syriac version, 549; Various explanations of the text problems, 551; Philo's theory of the origin of the human soul, 552; Origin of the Lewis text, 554; Compared with the Curetonian, 555; Variations of the Syriac version before the Peshitto, 556. | |
| CONTROVERSY IN HIGH PLACES. By <i>A. F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)</i> , . . . | 557 |
| Discussion between the Protestant Bishop of Manchester and the Catholic Bishop of Salford, 557; Fallacies resulting from Dr. Moorehouse's attitude, 558; No basis for superiority on the part of the Established Church, 559; Weakness of the Archbishop of Canterbury's position, 560; Bishop Billsborrow's attitude is based on solid ground, 562; Attitude of the Catholic as opposed to that of the Anglican mind, 563; The only way to effect "reunion," 565; What is involved in the controversy about the supremacy of the Holy See, 567; Dr. Moorehouse's position fatal to doctrine and discipline, 569. | |
| ITALY'S SILVER JUBILEE. By <i>Rev. William Poland, S.J.</i> , . . . | 571 |
| United Italy and the conditions preceding it, 571; Victor Emmanuel and his revolutionary masters, 572; The taking of Rome and the farcical plebiscite, 573; The law of guarantees and the freedom of the Pope, 574; A "great nation" living far beyond its means, 575; Confiscation of Church property has not stopped the ever increasing deficits, 576; Over-taxation has brought hardship to all classes, 577; Italy's tariff methods illustrated, 578; Enormous increase of the Italian public debt, 579; The banks have been greatly strained, 580; Silver swept away and paper at a great discount, 581; Business failures and heavy mortgages, 582; Vandalism of the government—Premier Crispi, 583; Evolution of his political career, 584; Attitude of Italian Catholics towards the monarchy, 586; Why the truth about "United Italy" has not been told sooner, 587; Effect of the example of public robbery given by the government, 588; It is time the people were growing tired of the abuses, 589; A gigantic theft of charitable funds, 590; Rome as a capital has failed the purpose of the revolutionists, 591. | |
| A BENEDICTINE RESTORATION. By <i>R. F. O'Connor</i> , . . . | 592 |
| Origin of the great monastery of Solesmes, 592; Its early history, 593; Restored after the Hundred Years' War, 595; A period of deteriorating influence, 596; Reform by the Saint Maur congregation, 597; Dispersion of the monks by the Revolution, and the restoration of the Solesmes house by Dom Guéranger, 598; Its vicissitudes in the meantime, 599; Meeting and overcoming great difficulties, 600; Installation of the new community, 601; Since then it has played a very important part, 602; Dom Guéranger's controversy with Prince de Broglie, 603; His services at the Vatican Council, 604; His death and the honors paid to his memory, 605. | |
| CATHOLIC PROTECTORIES AND REFORMATORIES. By <i>Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.</i> | 607 |
| Christianity has ever proved its divine origin by its charities, 607; This part of its mission it has also extended to education, 608; The Church's institutions of education and charity in America, 609; The pre-eminent position of reformatories and protectories, 610; A few of the leading institutions of this kind, 611; Though the smallest in number, they are among the most important of the Church's works, 612; The two great charities of New York, 613; Lord Rosebery's tribute to Father Drumgoole, 615; The New York Catholic protectority and its founder, 616; Archbishop Hughes' tribute to Dr. Ives and his work, 618; The Protectory's departments, 619; The Church's practice of the virtue of charity has no parallel, 620; Girard College, Philadelphia, 621; Public policy as a motive for caring for the unfortunate classes, 622; The duty of the State, 623; The public charities of some of our great American cities, 624; Embarrassing circumstances of the child problem, 625; The duty of the State is a civil duty, 626; When religion is the controlling force in education, 627; Daniel Webster on the part of religion in education, 628; Other typical Americans speak to the same effect, 629; Strong commendations from a Hebrew—the views of Huxley and Spencer, 631; The Christian religion forms a part of the common law of the land, 632; Religious liberty secured in every State of the Union, 634; In Pennsylvania Catholics must look to themselves alone to support their charities, 635; The New York Protectory a model for that proposed by Archbishop Ryan, 636; Elbridge T. Gerry's tribute to the former, 637; Governor Hoyt on the superiority of private benevolent institutions, 639; The Church and the State in their respective spheres, 640. | |
| SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. T. J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> , . . . | 641 |
| Precious stones, 641; Gems and jewels—characteristics of precious stones, 642; Cutting, 647; Form of gems, polishing, 648; Engraving, setting, 649; Weight and classification of gems, the individual gems, 650; Some remarkable diamonds, 656; Crown jewels, 658; The United States, 659. | |
| THE EVOLUTION OF EVOLUTION. By <i>Prof. St. George Mivart, F.R.S.</i> , . . . | 673 |
| The modern system of evolution essentially irrational, 673; The change from thirteenth to sixteenth century was decidedly for the worse, 674; The fact not to be explained by a weakening of the Church's spiritual weapons, 675; Physical science widening the gulf between the old and the new systems, 676; Mischief wrought by Descartes and Berkeley, 677; The part that association has played in the evolution of evolution, 678; Kant against Hume, but both equally mischievous, 679; Biological science as a contributor to the result, 680; How a rational theory of evolution must consider the world, 681; Promulgation of Darwin's theory of natural | |

selection, 682; The data of Weismann and Haeckel, 683; Haeckel's theory of the primary condition of organic life, 685; Bateson's "Materials for the Study of Organic Organizations," 686; The body of an animal has its own innate laws, 687; Variations in parts which are serially symmetrical, 688; An unfair and exceedingly shallow criticism, 689; The question of discontinuous variation, 690; Structural differences between American and Old-World apes, 691; Darwin's notion of feminine influence on changes, 693; The non-theistic theory of evolution powerless to explain the true nature of the organic world, 694; Non-theistic evolution born in original sin, 695; Preparing the way for views other than those of naturalism, 696; What the true logical system of evolution teaches, 697.

ROME AND ITS RECENT RUINS. By *Rev. Thomas Hughes, S.J.*, 698

Rome threatened with presenting the spectacle of modern ruins, 698; The steady undermining of social and religious life, 699; The inside and outside views of Rome, 700; How the compiler of the guide-book regards Rome, 701; The present position of Imperial Rome, 702; The relation to it of Papal Rome, 703; Superficial view of the number of churches and charities in Rome, 704; Charities that are educational institutions, 705; The confiscations that followed the invasion of 1870, 706; The reason for the great number of churches, 707; And more may be added at any time, 708; The reflection of old heathen Rome, 709; The history of Christian Rome in its monuments, 710; The glory of the friends of God celebrated in shrines, 711; Rome's mediæval vicissitudes, 712; Interior life of Rome as manifested in charity and culture, 714; Library treasures of Papal Rome, 715; The personality of the Popes, 716; Firmness of the Papacy in a world of unsteadiness, 717; Dulling the public sense to the enormities of public dishonesty, 718; What is needed to set things right, 719; When will the great injustice that has been done to Rome be righted? 720.

INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES (CONCLUDING ARTICLE). By *Richard R. Elliott*, 721

Summary of preceding articles on Mr. Pilling's work, 721; Algonquian records preserved in manuscript, 722; Scanty remains of New England and Pennsylvania Indians, 723; The first Jesuit missionaries in North America, 725; Commencement of a glorious history, 726; Character of the manuscripts of that time, 727; Algonquian dictionaries, 728; Life of those Catholic missionaries, 729; How they compiled their Indian works, 730; Bishop Baraga and Father Jucker, 732; Names of missionaries positively identified as authors of Indian manuscripts, 733; Description of some of the works, 734; A misleading report on Father Meurin, 736; Father Rasles' Abnaki dictionary, 737; The late Dr. Shea liberally quoted, 738; Maryland Jesuits, 739; Catholic Indian tribes of the West, 740; Cardinal Mezzofanti studied American Indian languages, 741; Algonquian manuscripts in Canada and in the United States, 742; The Jesuits established the first college in North America, 743; The last survivor of a noble band, 744; A valuable collection of missionary lore scattered, 746; The greatest of Mr. Pilling's works kept from being perfect by Mr. Powell, 748; Death of the great compiler, 749.

LEO XIII. AND HISTORICAL RESEARCH—RECENT WORK IN THE VATICAN LIBRARY. By *Rev. E. Soutif, C.S.C.*, 750

Facilitating the survey of historical questions in France, 750; Value and meaning of the words, "The Archives of the Vatican," 751; Some sample treasures and official Papal records, 752; America well represented, 753; What Pope Leo XIII. has done for historical research, 755; Workers of all shades of opinion in the Vatican Library, 757; What some of them have already done, 758; A vast amount of new and piquant information obtained, 760; The Holy Father increasing as well as opening his treasures, 761; Facilities for using the archives, 762; An appeal for more Americans to be sent to Rome, 764; Real value of the Holy Father's library, 765.

EDUCATION IN ANCIENT GREECE. By *Prof. Charles G. Herbermann, Ph.D.*, 766

What we know of the subject is only a fragment, 766; Greece a country of many states and varied customs, 767; No knowledge of the beginning of Greek schools, 768; The first mention of them in history, 769; What led to their rapid and general spread, 770; Solon's school laws preserved by Æschines, 771; No State provision for a long time except for the Athenian orphans, 772; In later days other towns maintained schools from public funds, 773; Making much of education, but having little respect for the teachers, 774; Salaries of elementary teachers, 776; Where the teacher dispensed his wisdom, 777; A word of the scholars, 778; The Greek husband in politics and at home, 779; How the boys went to school, 780; The men who shaped the youthful mind and heart of Greece, 782; The scholar's occupations, 783; The rod an important factor, 784; Protests against wholesale flogging, 785; The scholar's attempts to become acquainted with the muses, 786; Difficulties in the way of learning to spell and read, 787; Homer not the only reading book, 788; Poetry as a substitute for a catechism of simple morality, 789; Importance of distinct enunciation appreciated, 790; The aim of the lessons in reading and writing, 791; Writing materials, 792; The Greek arithmetic, 793; Music as an aid to morality, piety and patriotism, 795; The hymns and songs taught by the citharist, 796; The lyre the national instrument, 797; Gymnastics in Greek education, 798; Physical culture and athletics, 799; Where gymnastics were taught, 800; Examinations and vacations, 802; Changes effected in educational methods from the Macedonian period, 803; Simplicity of early Greek literary education, 805; Greek education essentially moral, religious and utilitarian, 806.

JOSEPH DE MAISTRE. By *T. L. L. Teeling*, 807

His parentage, 807; The little that is known of his early life, 808; Educated first at home and then by the Jesuits, 809; At the University of Turin, 810; Living at home in Chambéry as a young lawyer, 811; Elements of the community, 812;

Joseph de Maistre at one time a Freemason, 813; The Church and the secret society, 814; Chambéry's last pageant of semi-mediæval grandeur, 815; This inspired J. de Maistre to write his first book, 817; How he stored his mind with general knowledge, 818; Legal duties not altogether congenial to him, 819; How he approached the state of matrimony, 820; Revolt in Savoy against its king, 821; The province seized by France, and De Maistre becomes an exile, 822; Re-entering political life in Turin, 823; He becomes minister to Russia and expresses his views of the Papacy, etc., 824; His views of Russia and the Russians, 826; He believed in feminine inferiority, 827; But he was always a favorite with distinguished women, 828; The little that is recorded of his faithful wife, 829; It was in St. Petersburg he wrote his best works, 830; Their Russian exile apparently very congenial to the De Maistre family, 831; Count de Maistre returns to Turin—Lamar-tine's picture of him, 832; Importance of De Maistre's teaching and influence, 834; What some other great Catholic writers owe to him, 835; He advocated a wise liberty, 836; Light thrown on his character by his correspondence, 837; Re-vival of interest in his works, 838.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN MANITOBA. By *John S. Ewart, Q. C.*, 839

Canadian schools under the Confederation Act of 1837, 839; Formation of the Province of Manitoba, 840; The point on which the present difficulty hinges, 841; A lesson from the conduct of New Brunswick, 843; Religious change in the population of Manitoba, 844; How the present Liberal (?) Ministry came into power, 845; Effect of the Jesuits' Estate Act of Quebec, 846; Opposition to it in Ontario and elsewhere, 847; Passage of the Martin School Act of Manitoba, 848; Its provisions as to religion, 849; The act in the courts, 850; Provisions of the Manitoba Charter, 851; Opinion of the highest court, 852; Difficulty of the Dominion Government's position, 853; The famous order-in-council, 854; The Manitoba Government's reply, 855; The second remedial order-in-council, and objection to it, 856; All that was left for the Dominion Government to do, 857; How the Manitoba school case now stands, 858.

THE OUTLOOK FOR IRELAND. By *Bryan J. Clinch*, 859

The fate of Irish Home Rule not settled by the recent election, 859; Why autonomy must be granted, 860; The change in the temper of the English people towards Ireland, 861; The Irish question had little to do with Lord Rosebery's fall, 862; Home Rule a live political question in England to-day, 863; It depends most on the Irish people themselves, 864; The non-office-holding rule of the Irish members, 865; Their Parliamentary policy, 866; Importance of complete harmony in the Irish party, 867.

SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By *Rev. T. J. A. Freeman, S. J.*, 885

Precious stones, gems, jewels—II., corundum group, 868; Some large sapphires, 870; Some large rubies, 872; Chrysoberyl group, 873; Spinel group, 874; Topaz and beryl groups, 875; Hyacinth and garnet groups, 878; Tourmaline and quartz groups, 879; Chrysolite, turquoise and opal groups, 882; The pearl group, 883; Famous pearls, 885.

BOOK NOTICES.

| | PAGE | | PAGE |
|--|---------------|---|---------------|
| Acadia ; Missing Links of a Lost Chapter, etc. (Richard)..... | 891 | Leben Unseres Herrn Jesus Christus (Ca- mus and Keppler)..... | 447 |
| Agnosticism and Religion (Lucas)..... | 667 | Legends and Stories of the Holy Child Jesus (Lutz)..... | 224 |
| A Life's Decision (Allies)..... | 435 | Lehre des Joannes Cassianus (Hoch)..... | 442 |
| Analysis of the Eutropius, a Greek Drama | 895 | Letters of St. Alphonsus M. de Liguori (Grimm)..... | 448 |
| Bernadette of Lourdes (Pouvillon)..... | 448 | Let us go to the Holy Table (Lambert)..... | 224 |
| Biographical Dictionary of English Cath- olics, Vol. IV. (Gillow)..... | 895 | Life of Bl. John Gabriel Perboyre..... | 223 |
| Books and Reading (Brother Azarias)..... | 444 | Life of Mary Monholland, Sister of Mercy Little Office of the B. V. and Office of the Dead..... | 448 |
| Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Balti- more (Turner)..... | 445 | Little Sisters of the Poor (Mrs. Ram)..... | 221 |
| Catholic and Protestant Countries Com- pared (Young)..... | 421 | Loyalty to Church and State (Mgr. Satolli) | 670 |
| Catholic Girl in the World (Whyte Aves), D. C..... | 224 | Magister Choralis (Haberl and Donnelly) | 448 |
| Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Func- tions (O'Loan)..... | 448 | Manual of Scripture History (Richards).. | 448 |
| Characteristics of True Devotion (Grou and Clifton, S.J.)..... | 224 | Meditations for all the Days of the Year for Priests, etc. (Hamon)..... | 437 |
| Christian Faith and the Individual (Allies) | 444 | Memoir of Mother Frances Raphael Drane, O.S.D. (Wilberforce)..... | 887 |
| Christliche Ikonographie (Detzel)..... | 446 | Muster des Predigers (Schleisinger)..... | 896 |
| Compendium Sacre Liturgie Juxta Ritum Romanum (Wapelhorst)..... | 448 | Mostly Boys (Finn, S.J.)..... | 224 |
| Conferences on the Spiritual Life (De Ra- vignan)..... | 671 | Office of the Dead and Little Office of the B. V. M..... | 448 |
| Curé of Ars (O'Meara)..... | 447 | Officium Parvum B. M. V..... | 448 |
| Das Problem des Leidens in der Moral (Keppler)..... | 447 | Outlines of Dogmatic Theology (Hunter) | 438, 672, 894 |
| Divine Love and the Love of God's Most Blessed Mother (Weld)..... | 672, 896 | Patrologia Syriaca (Graffin)..... | 424 |
| Dogmatic Theology, Outlines of (Hunter) | 438, 672, 894 | Poetical Works of Lageniensis (Canon O'Hanlon)..... | 222 |
| Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles (MacEvilly)..... | 217 | Praelectiones Dogmaticæ (Chr. Pesch, S.J.) | 220 |
| Flower of the Flock, etc. (Egan)..... | 224 | Psychologia Rationalis (Bæder)..... | 441 |
| Formation of Christendom, Vol. I. (Allies) | 444 | Public School System of the United States | 224 |
| Franzelin, John Baptist, S.J. (Walsh)..... | 426 | Retreat, Consisting of Thirty-three Dis- courses, with Meditations for the Clergy, etc. (Hedley)..... | 446 |
| From the Greeks to Darwin (Osburn)..... | 448 | Revealed Religion (Hettinger and Bow- den)..... | 660 |
| Gælic Journal, Vol. VI. (Dublin)..... | 223 | Rituale Romanum, Editio quarta..... | 896 |
| Geschichte Des Breviers (Bäumer)..... | 896 | Sacerdotis Vade Mecum (Andreis)..... | 448 |
| Geschichte des Collegium Germanicum- Hungaricum in Rom (Steinhuber)..... | 439 | Sacred Scriptures (The), or the Written Word of God (Humphrey)..... | 448 |
| Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes (Jans- sen and Pastor)..... | 219 | Short Instructions in the Art of Singing Plain Chant (Singenberger)..... | 448 |
| History of St. Philomena (Bowden)..... | 668 | Social Evolution (Kidd)..... | 663 |
| History of the Mass (O'Brien)..... | 224 | St. Chantal and the Foundation of the Visitation (Bougand)..... | 431 |
| History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages (Pastor and Antrobus)... | 896 | St. Paul and His Missions (Fouard)..... | 434 |
| Hygiene, with Anatomy and Physiology (Edwards)..... | 448 | Story of Courage (Lathrop)..... | 215 |
| Inner Life of Father Thomas Burke, O.P. Institutiones Philosophicæ (Mandato)..... | 438 | Students' Handbook of British and Amer- ican Literature (Jenkins and Viger)... | 224 |
| Iroquois and the Jesuits (Donohue)..... | 896 | Synopsis Tractatus Scholastici de Deo Uno (Stentrup)..... | 672 |
| Jesus, the Good Shepherd (De Goesbriand) | 224 | The One Mediator, or Sacrifice and Sacra- ments (Humphrey)..... | 448 |
| Jewish Race in Ancient and Roman His- tory (Rendu)..... | 896 | Things of the Mind (Spalding)..... | 430 |
| Journals Kept During Times of Retreat (Morris and Polen)..... | 448 | Tour Round My Library, etc. (Comegys).. | 672 |
| | | Tractatus de Deo Uno (De San)..... | 428 |
| | | Watches of the Sacred Passion (Gallwey) | 445 |
| | | Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexicon, Part 95..... | 447 |

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XX.—JANUARY, 1895.—No. 77.

JOHN BAPTIST DE ROSSI.

IT was with sincere sorrow that all cultured persons, without distinction of belief or race, heard of the death of this great Christian scholar, whose name and fame were known wherever there was love of letters, or interest in the past of our Christian and Western society. Like Gladstone in politics, or Tennyson and Holmes in literature, he had occupied so long the office of a supreme teacher in his special sciences, that he became almost identified with those branches of human knowledge, and his departure came as an almost irreparable loss, so much did it carry away of erudition, experience and direction, and so large a void did it leave in the hearts of many who loved the man no less than they venerated the scholarly teacher. The writer has been requested by the editor of the REVIEW to furnish an account of this prince of historical archæologists. Willingly would we have left it to a more competent pen and to one whose acquirements and personal knowledge of the *Maestro* amply fit him to proclaim the lesson of this rarely beautiful and productive life. But his firm insistence leaves no loophole of escape, and the following pages are offered as a very imperfect but sincere outline of the life and labors of one of the greatest children of the old Mother Church of Rome.

I.

John Baptist de Rossi was born at Rome, February 23, 1822, of parents distinguished for station and piety.¹ As a child he loved

¹ The biographical items for this sketch of the public career of De Rossi are drawn from the Albums or proceedings of the festivities on the occasions respectively of his

to read the lives of the saints, especially of the earlier ones, and satisfied his youthful curiosity by long excursions through an Italian *leggendario*, which happened to contain, what is rare in works of pure piety, some account of the authorities or original sources whence the sketches of the saints were drawn. This may have been the original impulse that turned his mind to critico-historical investigations which became at a very early period an absorbing passion. Speaking in later life of his early days, he was wont to assert that archæology was surely his vocation, since he could not remember that any attraction for other sciences ever asserted itself in him. His studies were made, like those of the other Roman youths, at the Collegio Romano and the Sapienza or Pontifical University. In the former he distinguished himself by aptitude in the study of the classics, never so foreign to the Italian as to the northern mind, and profited no little by the epigraphic instruction of the classic archæologists Secchi and Bonvicini. By a subtle natural instinct he was drawn to the study of epigraphy, for which the materials stared at him from every corner of the old Papal stronghold, and we may date from his early college days the growth of that marvellous insight into the spirit and the rules which governed the ancient Romans in the composition and erection of those multitudinous inscriptions whose marble and bronze relics are forever coming to light beneath the pick of the excavator. At the Sapienza he followed the study of law, more for the sake of the position it furnished than with any thought of living by it, and after an exceptionally brilliant course, in which he was always the leader of his class, was declared, in 1843, *doctor utriusque juris ad honorem*. A mere chance threw him in the way of the famous Mai, and by his influence the young De Rossi was made Scriptor or official copyist to the administration of the Vatican Archives, an office which he held until his death and which enabled him to acquire a valuable acquaintance with a multitude of archæological treasures hidden away most jealously from less fortunate men. In the long years that he spent transcribing, collating and disposing the rare parchments of that unique collection, his extraordinary memory grasped countless indications that aided him afterwards in his peculiar labors among the *rudera* of Christian antiquity. Surely it was the guiding hand of Providence that set the ambitious and ardent youth, not on the tedious and dangerous road of the diplomatic career, but on the sequestered paths that finally led out among the solitudes of the Appian Way and along the deserted banks of Tiber, where her yellow waves gnaw their tortuous

sixtieth and seventieth birthdays (1882, 1892) and from the brochure *Giovanni Battista de Rossi, Fondatore della Scienza di Archeologia Sacra, Cenni Biografici*, per P. M. Baumgarten (Rome, 1892).

road to the sea. And, surely, again, it was a disposition of Providence that kept him a lifetime at the official and professional study of the written records of the past, and absolutely forced upon him the conviction that the written documents were to be used *pari passu* with the material monuments, and that the facts of Christian antiquity could never be properly illuminated until the combined light of both was cast upon them.

It would seem that in the family of De Rossi the Catacombs were a frequent subject of conversation, and awakened, almost from infancy, an unquenchable curiosity in the mind of John Baptist. We hear that his father eagerly sought the rare work of Antonio Bosio, "Roma Sotterranea," as a premium for his gifted son, and that the favorite excursion of De Rossi and his brother Michele, when scarcely out of their teens, was out on the lonely wastes of the Campagna, prying around among the entrances to the deserted cemeteries, whither the ancient Christians were tracked like rabbits, or gazing down the *lucernaria* or loopholes that once let in air and light to this subterraneous world, and yet serve as buoys to mark the location of the main pathways across the ocean of ruins that lie beneath. What a fascination there is in this Roman soil! While the grassy mounds and sunken ditches that mark the humble refuges of the early Christian flock were inflaming the piety of the youthful De Rossi, the classical memories of Thrasea Paetus and Helvidius Priscus, of Arnold da Brescia and Cola di Rienzi were firing other Roman youths of the same age. While the genius of De Rossi was planning the discovery of the little Christian communities, those protoplasms around which the mediæval Christendom was one day compacted, hundreds of his companions were conspiring for the violent restoration of that old republic of blood, iron and robbery over whose recent grave the first Christians began their memorable propaganda. In this fated city there goes on forevermore a warfare of the spirit and the flesh, and the passionate outcry and reaction of the conquered world break violently in upon the alleluias and litanies of the Church, even as the hoarse shouts of the pagan rabble sullied the holy purity of the Christian service in the bowels of the Campagna.

It was not without some difficulty that De Rossi obtained his father's consent to the indulgence of these antiquarian tastes, which seemed to promise very poor results, either of fame or advancement. In the end, however, he became the disciple of the Padre Marchi, a well-known Jesuit numismatist, whose discovery of the tomb of Saints Protus and Hyacinthus in the catacomb of St. Agnes, on the Nomentan Way, entitles him to an eminent place in the annals of Christian archæology. Still greater gratitude is owing him for the formation of the young De Rossi, long

his inseparable companion and co-laborer in those sacred mines whose galleries are hallowed by the blood of martyrs innumerable and the pious footfalls of pilgrims still more innumerable, and whose walls are impregnated with the holy aspirations of three great epochs of human culture. Padre Marchi was the last of the old line of Christian archæologists which began at the end of the sixteenth century, with Macarius, Ciacconio, De Winghe and Bosio, was continued in the seventeenth in the persons of Fabretti, Boldetti, Buonarrotti, Lupi, Marangoni and Bottari, and in the early decades of this century was represented in France by De Caumont, Didron, Greppo, Raoul-Rochette, Martin and Cahier, in Germany by Augusti, Binterim and Münter; in Italy by Sarti and Setele. He was the official guardian, or *custode*, of the catacombs, and, as such, inherited much practical knowledge and traditional lore concerning them. He had himself begun a great work on the monuments of early Christian art, of which only one volume was ever published. Political vicissitudes and his own discovery of the qualities of De Rossi made him abandon the work to his young disciple, who had quickly caught the enthusiasm of the old Jesuit, and brought to the holy cause youth, talent, learning, industry, vocation, and the divine intuitions of genius. The world-famous discoveries of De Rossi in the Catacomb of St. Callixtus—those subtle, almost prophetic calculations by which he laid open a vast and intricate city beneath the vineyards and the garden patches of the Roman suburbs, are too well known to need rehearsal here. Suffice it to say that early in the fifties men recognized a new star in the firmament of learning, and that public attention was thenceforth fastened on the young archæologist as one who had struck out a new path, and would soon modify the methods and conclusions of all past workers in Christian archæology. He interested Pius IX. in his work, and obtained the creation of a special commission for the excavations, in which he was ever the guiding spirit and counsel. All his great publications were begun or planned about this time, and the rest of his life devoted to the elevation of his favorite study to the recognized rank of a true science—one of the few which the Catholic Church can say that she has completely won over to her side.

No one was better known in the great archives and libraries of Europe than De Rossi. Since 1853 he visited frequently the principal collections of mediæval manuscripts in Italy, France, Germany, Switzerland and England. The archivists of Berne, Paris, Venice, Milan and many other cities welcomed his visits and threw open their treasures to the one man in Europe who could compare them intelligently with those of the Vatican and make the old parchments give up the mysteries of the past. So

high and unique was his reputation that foreign governments entrusted most precious manuscripts to their representatives at Rome for his use, and deemed themselves honored when he had illustrated their contents or their history. As his fame grew, learned bodies in Europe and America showered honorific titles and memberships on him; orders and crosses and medals were offered for his acceptance; governments, universities and national academies vied with the papacy to do honor to the founder of the new science of Christian Archæology. His name became a household word throughout Christendom as that of the famous wizard who had conjured up before our eyes long-buried cities, and made the men and women of ancient days move as in a mighty kinetoscope. Among all his distinctions the proudest was that of Prefect, or Curator of the Christian Museum attached to the Vatican Library—a life-office created especially for him by Leo XIII., who was no less his friend and admirer than Pius IX. The latter had offered to put him at the head of the Archives after the unfortunate incident of Theiner, but De Rossi, with characteristic modesty and prudence, begged the Pope to permit him to decline.

In 1882 his sixtieth birthday was celebrated with extraordinary enthusiasm, shared equally by kings and republics, by Catholics and non-Catholics. It recalled those splendid coronation scenes of the Renaissance, when the Italian world burst out in spontaneous apotheosis of the poet who best voiced the multitudinous aspirations of its great heart. Only, instead of on the Capitol, men were gathered at the Lateran; instead of a crown of laurel, they offered conviction and gratitude; instead of the perishable allurements of verse and song, they crowned the hard-won victories of a discoverer who had gone out upon a dark and unknown sea, with only the compass of genius, and given back to the Christian world its earliest provinces that the great cleft of the middle times had forced into a well-nigh mythical obscurity. A similar scene was repeated on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, in April, 1892, when his bust was unveiled in the little fourth century basilica of SS. Sixtus and Cæcelia,¹ that rises over the Cata-

¹ The bust, of white Serravezza marble, is the work of Luchetti, and is ornamented with the following inscription:

IOHANNI · BAPTISTAE · DE · ROSSI
 QVO · DVCE · CHRISTIANA · VETVSTAS
 IN · NOVVM · DECVS · EFFLORVIT
 PONTIFICVM · HEROVMQVE · PRIMAEBVAE · ECCLESIAE
 ILLVXERE · TROPHAEA
 NATALI · EIVS · SEPTVAGESIMO
 CVLTORES · MARTYRV · ET · SACRAE · ANTIQVITATIS
 MAGISTRO · OPTIMO · P · A · MDCCCXCI

comb of St. Callixtus, amid the plaudits and congratulations of a large assembly, among which were many representatives of the governments and universities of Europe and of academic bodies and learned societies from both sides of the ocean. The learning of two hemispheres bowed down before the humble and honest Christian investigator, and it sends a thrill of enthusiasm through the coldest veins to think that human science was once more doing homage to a model of Christian faith on the blood-stained floor of St. Callixtus, and that our proud century looked not unsympathetically on this new curving of the altitudes of the human mind beneath the sweet servage of Christ.

In modest and touching language the aged archæologist reviewed his work in the catacombs, and thanked the eminent scholars who had come from afar to greet him, and to console his declining years with approval and acceptance of his labors. There is an echo of the *Nunc Dimittis* in the proud joy with which he referred to his numerous progeny of disciples already equipped for work, and ready to occupy the field when the *Maestro* laid down his arms. Shortly afterwards he was stricken with paralysis, from which his physical frame never recovered, though his intellect remained undimmed to the last. He had reached a green old age, and enjoyed all the honors that could fall to a scholar's lot. He had shed lustre upon the Church of Rome, both as head of the Christian body and as a local community, and caused the name of *Johannes Baptista De Rossi Romanus* to be pronounced everywhere with veneration and respect. The world was better for his labors, and the spirit of peace and conciliation had made much progress by reason of his commanding genius and all-embracing charity. As his strength failed, it was hoped that the country air would revive him, and Castel Gondolfo, the summer residence of the popes, was placed at his disposal by order of Leo XIII. But he never rallied, and on September 20th, he peacefully passed away. His remains were brought back to Rome, and temporarily buried at San Lorenzo. But it is said that a nobler resting place is in store, and that he will be buried in the papal crypt at Saint Callixtus, like a hero on the field of battle. Charlemagne was not more properly entombed beneath the dome of Aix-la-Chapelle, nor Chateaubriand on the wave-beaten rock of St. Malo, than De Rossi will be in the heart of the great Christian cemetery which his genius discovered and rebuilt. He did many difficult things in his life, but nothing to compare with the restoration of *The Cemetery* par excellence, the centre at once of early Christian life at Rome, the nucleus of the landed wealth of the Roman Church, and the mausoleum for a hundred years of her most celebrated pontiffs. He died working, dictating and commenting, like Irish Columba and English

Bede, and his eyes closed upon the pageant of the church militant only to open on that of the church triumphant, whose vicissitudes and memories he had so accurately and piously illustrated upon earth.

*Nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos
In tantum spe tollet avos ; nec Romula quondam
Ullo se tantum tellus jactabit alumno.*

II.

De Rossi was one of those rare men in whom the entire knowledge of the civilization of the past ages seems to be mirrored, an encyclopædist or polyhistor, to whom the whole range of human thought and endeavor along the lines of intellectual culture was thoroughly familiar. Before the Renaissance such men were rarer still, for, though the mediæval world produced men of great eminence, whose imprint on human society will never fade, it was still an age of action and creation. It had little leisure or capacity for the calm survey of the classic past and its own origins, and perhaps less taste for cultures that were purely pagan, or at least mixed. There was still a touch of the rugged Tertullian in the mediæval Christian. Therefore we cannot class the great archæologist with St. Thomas or St. Bonaventure or Dante. His place is with men like Peiresc, Sirmond, Maffei, Mabillon, Montfaucon, and their congeners. He is not an artist like those who built the cathedrals of Cologne or Strasburg, but like Cellini and Francia, a worker in detail, yet with high ideals, and a definite purpose into which every act of his life fits with perfect neatness and propriety. His writings cover the entire period of Greco-Roman civilization, and he was no less familiar with its pagan than with its Christian side. The Rome of Augustus and the Rome of Damasus and Leo were equally well-known to him. During more than fifty years he gave to the public a multitude of writings, great and small, in which he shed new light on Christian antiquities, on the inscriptions of the ancients, both Greek and Latin, both heathen and Christian; on the laws, manners and habits of Rome; on manuscripts and ancient handwriting; on mediæval art and bibliography. He carried on at the same time a vast system of excavations, organized the Christian Museum of the Lateran, pushed forward the cataloguing of the Vatican archives, and kept a school after the manner of the old philosophers. Indeed, merely to describe intelligently the outlines of his life-work is no easy task, and might well occupy more space than is at the disposal of the writer. Still by classifying the numerous works of his pen we may hope to present something like a fair general view of his enormous literary activity.

De Rossi was pre-eminently an epigraphist. The science of in-

scriptions was his first love; out of his devotion to the *monumenta litterata* sprang all his other researches, and to them were finally referred his most striking conquests in the domain of antiquity. Inscriptions engraved, painted, scratched or stamped; pagan and Christian, public-historical, domestic, and artistic; on stone, bronze, ivory, wood or copper; on buildings, coins, or antiquarian objects; whether found on the original materials, patiently gathered from the printed works of the ancients, or dug out of old mediæval collections, he was first in every department, and labored in all with equal intelligence, devotion, and success. Epigraphy, which was formerly but an ancillary science to history, and an armory of apologetic weapons to the Christian, became in his hands an independent study, with proper and peculiar methods, principles, and conclusions of value for themselves.

The passion of inscriptions has been always strong among powerful and cultured peoples, as the modern discoveries in Assyria, Egypt, Persia, and India abundantly testify. Inscriptions were the heralds of Hellenism in its day of pride, as they are to-day the witnesses of the range of its influence. But never were they more numerous than in the palmy days of imperial Rome, when they stared at the citizen from the arches and the statues of the *fora*, and looked down on him from a hundred basilicas and temples in every city of the mighty East-West world. The walls, the roads, the aqueducts; the boundaries of domains, public and private; the seats in the theatres, the weights and measures, the weapons and curios; the rough marble in blocks and the tiles on the roofs—every material object of public or private life, afforded a space, great or small, to the insatiable “man of letters.” Public acts, like treaties, alliances, plebiscita, law-edicts, senatus-consulta, and imperial constitutions, were eternalized in bronze while private transactions were preserved with no less care on durable material, as the banker’s accounts, the rent rolls, the tavern bills and political manifestoes of Pompeii show us. Sometimes whole annals or biographies were written out on stone, as we see by the Parian *Marmorchronik* and the famous *Monumentum Ancyranum*. Only one familiar with the texts and details of early imperial history can imagine what a multitudinous mass of inscriptions must have existed intact before the downfall of the ancient culture. But they perished miserably at the hands of those two great enemies of human achievements, cruel man and relentless time. One ground them into the earth, and the other swept away all reminiscences of their ancient estate, so that the same silent desolation spread over those relics of Roman greatness which Rome herself had so often brought upon the greatness of older civilizations than her own. Still they did not perish unheeded.

For various reasons the ancients, especially the refined *literati* of Alexandria, made collections of inscriptions, and such useful and pious labors were carried on by Latin scholars, both pagan and Christian. There are the clearest evidences that such mixed *Corpora* of epigraphical material existed in the West in the fifth and sixth centuries, and that they were favorite books for the compilers of epigrams, and the writers of funeral, sacred, or honorary inscriptions. They contained careful transcriptions of many old epigraphs in elegiac, lyric or epic metre. Often the original lettering was accurately reproduced, and the precious chronological notes, or indices of the time when the original was executed were preserved. But even this bridge was in time broken down, and those priceless early collections are represented to us now by manuscripts of the Carolingian epoch, chiefly pilgrim books or itineraries of wandering monks and travelers, who jotted down among other miscellanea out of the older *Corpora*, then worn, decayed, or neglected, such ancient Latin inscriptions as were likely to be of use or interest in their own little circles beyond the Alps.

The merest chance has preserved to us a very few specimens of this literary work in manuscripts that belonged originally to Einsiedeln, Lorsch, Milan, Klosterneuburg, Gottweich, Verdun, etc. Their text is now corrupt; there are great breaks in them; they are often mutilated, and in the worst possible condition; but they are the invaluable link that connects the modern science of Christian epigraphy with the past, while they are also of importance for the history of the collection of Latin inscriptions in general. It is well known that between the Renaissance of Charlemagne and the Italian Renaissance little or nothing was done for the preservation of the old inscriptions, which cast such rare light on the history, literature, and manners of the society that set them in place. A few names shine out, relieving this long neglect: Rienzi, Poggio Bracciolini, the wonderful Ciriaco di Ancona, and his counterpart in devotion to Christian epigraphy, Petrus Sabinus. But with the Italian Renaissance came an astonishing, if excessive and harmful, awakening of piety towards the old classic world. Its smallest relics and fragments were collected and commented on with a sacred enthusiasm. Humanists and travellers, states and cities, popes and kings, and little potentates, collected personally or by commission great numbers of inscriptions, chiefly Latin, and arranged for public or private use, a new kind of museum, the lapidary galleries of the Renaissance. The sixteenth century saw the local gatherers at work, and also the first attempt at a printed collection made by the humanist, Conrad Peutinger, whose name remains attached to one of the most curious documents of antiquity—the *Tabula Peutingerii*, or road map of the Roman Empire. Bankers like the Fug-

gers, and rulers like Charles V., and Frederick of Austria, caught the contagion, and from that time the collection of inscriptions has gone on with almost unabated vigor. Until very recently a strict line of demarcation was not made by collectors between the Pagan and the Christian. Previous to this century, however, the former owe most to the zeal of Apians, Martin Smetius, Scaliger, Muratori, Maffei, and many others too numerous to mention, while the latter owe a deep debt of gratitude to such men as Bosio, Gruter, Sirmond, Doni, Cardinal Francesco Barberini, Suaresius, Gori, Zaccaria, Marini, and Mai, and to the different *custodi* of the catacombs in the eighteenth century.

In the first half of this century Marini, Mai, and Borghesi sustained the honor of the Italian name in the science of epigraphy, but their light pales before that of De Rossi, in whom occasion, genius, industry, and vocation conspired to produce the greatest epigraphist of all time, though he would himself be the last to deny his debt to the great workers who preceded him, and of whose printed and unprinted collections he made such constant use. It is totally foreign to our purpose to present here the results of his labors as an epigraphist; let it suffice that we give a brief account of the two great works in which can most easily be seen specimens of his peculiar talent and monuments of his industry, the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* and the *Inscriptiones Christianæ*. The former work was often begun in previous centuries, but as often abandoned. In time the French Academy put its hand to the work of collecting all the Latin inscriptions of antiquity, but owing to untoward circumstances, laid it aside. Finally the Royal Academy of Berlin took up the difficult task and has carried it on well nigh to completion.¹ Early in the fifties it made a formal application to De Rossi for aid in the work, and with the permission and encouragement of the Vatican authorities, he consented. Together with Henzen he edited the sixth volume of the *Corpus*, containing the Pagan or non-Christian inscriptions of Rome and Latium, and personally made many learned contributions to the entire work. His knowledge of the manuscript collections of inscriptions was of the greatest service at all times, as well as his free access to the Vatican archives, his familiarity with the topography of Rome and the suburbs, and his fine scent in reconstructing, which was the real secret of his genius.

It is not enough to know where the old inscriptions are, in what galleries, museums, archives, books and manuscripts the originals, whole or fragmentary, and their copies are to be found. Nor is it

¹ *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum regie Borussicæ editum*, Berolinii, in folio, vol. i.-xv., 1863-1885.

enough to read the language of the marbles and the bronzes with ease and intelligence. For a great epigraphist it requires something more. Much of the material has come down to us in a very imperfect shape, broken, disjointed, scattered, like the shreds of a letter thrown to the winds. Then there are the forgeries and the interpolations or mutilations to guard against, and the transcription errors of ancient copyists to correct. There are imperfect lines to piece out at the beginning or the end, and words to supply in the context, all of which must be done within certain narrow limits of space or grammar. There are the frequent abbreviations, never quite the same, even in epochs that follow closely upon one another. The magistracy, the law formulas, the military service, the priest-hoods and the sepulchral system have each their peculiar *sigla* or *litterae singulares*, by which commonly recurring notions are most easily expressed. And when all this is mastered, when the text is finally restored, and we can read at last what men once found worthy to say of themselves and their deeds, only a small part of the task is accomplished. There must come a teacher who shall interpret all this, and drawing upon an almost limitless treasure of philological, literary, historical and artistic lore, cause the cold marble and the hard bronze to speak, and give up the secrets of the men who erected them. The epigraphist must be archæologist at once and antiquarian, lawyer and philosopher, and be equally at home in the palace and the forum, among the soldiery and the priests, as in the wine shops of the Suburra and among the motley crowd that surges along the wharves of Tiber. No detail of ancient life, public or private, is useless to him, and out of his enormous collection of facts and observations and readings, he is forever drawing the items needed to strengthen a hypothesis or to weld together some long chain of reasoning.

It was precisely here that the wide classical reading of De Rossi, his fine memory and his systematic arrangement of notes, came to his aid, and enabled him to illustrate his epigraphic texts with a truly marvellous wealth of apposite citations, out of which, again, he knew how to draw the most striking lights upon the question at issue. His profound knowledge of the patristic texts was also of great help to him, since much of the old classic life and thought is embedded in them. But his superiority to most others lay in two things: the application of the geographical method to the study of the inscriptions, and the skill with which he used every contemporary document of any nature whatsoever when engaged on a text. Quite early in the Renaissance the wise idea had made its way that the inscriptions ought to be arranged in geographical families; *i.e.*, that they ought to be restored as much as possible to those conditions of time and space in which they

arose, so as to enable us to hear their natural interpreters—the contemporary and local history, language and manners—and to reconstruct the actual surroundings of these dumb witnesses of antiquity, that have, indeed, a voice, but for which an artificial throat and an artificial atmosphere must be prepared ere we can hear its tones. As early as 1842 De Rossi had proposed a return to this system in almost the first work of his juvenile pen, and he lived to see it triumphant in one of the noblest works that have issued from the brain of man, and which includes over one hundred and fifty thousand inscriptions, illustrating, with rarest accuracy, the history of Rome from the earliest days, when the treaty with Gabii was painted on shields of bull's hide, down to the hour when the kingly Goth sat as master on the Capitol, and bade his brother barbarians spare the records of their fallen ruler.¹

III.

I turn with pleasure to the *Inscriptiones Christianæ*, in which the second of De Rossi's great epigraphical merits is best illustrated. After all, the classical world is fairly well known and much of its literature has reached us. Its monuments are widely scattered and tell their own story very often. Occasionally entire sections come to the surface, as in Algiers and in Rome itself. Finally, in the popular memory there lives no small share of intelligence of the spirit and the deeds of ancient Rome and her subject world. How different is it with the history of Christianity within the same limits of time! In literature we can boast only of a collection of fragments, precious beyond imagination, but which are only a tithe of what once was, and are oftener the voice of defence and apology than of calm, full exposition of belief. Of monuments, until De Rossi arose, there was the greatest dearth, and among Christians the continuity of race and culture and habit has been so often broken that outside of the Church herself we cannot look for any vivid consciousness of the remote past. Over the history of the early Church there lies a deep twilight, out of which there loom, vague and indistinct, a few figures and situations. The want of an honest, synthetic view of those primitive days was not felt while the Christian unity was unbroken, but in the last three centuries no lost art has been more keenly deplored than the knowledge of the life and manners of the early Christian world. The value of the inscription was always recognized. They were, in fact, one of the earliest forms of Christian literary effort, and the *titulus* put up to St. James of Jerusalem, and the inscribed group of the Hæmorrhœissa, at Paneas, have a

¹ J. P. Waltzing: *Le recueil general des Inscriptions latines, et l'épigraphie latine depuis cinquante ans*. Louvain, 1892.

claim on our veneration only less than that due to the earliest literary remains of the post-apostolic age.¹

There seem to have been collections of Christian inscriptions and epigrams before the peace of the Church, and the fact is quite certain for the fourth and fifth centuries. The pious travelers of the Carolingian age preserved much of the material of these old collections, and for a long time their parchments, together with the writings of men like Venantius Fortunatus, Isidore of Seville, Alcuin, and others like Hibernicus Exul, Sedulius Scotus and the monks of Bobbio, were the only literary sources whence a knowledge of Christian inscriptions could be got. There were the churches, it is true, and the sepulchres of martyrs and confessors and holy bishops and popes; there was also a multitude of inscribed objects over the whole Christian world, but who could visit them all? Outside of a few in the *Liber Pontificalis* of Rome and a larger number in its namesake of Ravenna, we know of no attempt to collect even the epitaphs of a series of bishops. In the later Middle Ages the collecting of Christian inscriptions and epitaphs was almost utterly neglected. Here and there in the annals or chronicles of the time occasional reference is made to inscriptions or epitaphs, but on the whole the science was utterly neglected, though the use of inscriptions was by no means diminished. Not all the chiefs of the Italian Renaissance were pagan-minded. From its opening some attention was paid to the collecting and commenting of the ancient Christian inscriptions that fell well within the limits of the classic age. Not to speak of earlier attempts, we have large and valuable collections made at the end of the fifteenth century by Ciriaco di Ancona and Peter Sabinus. Among the great names of the counter-reformation, that of Antonio Bosio must always be held in honor, not alone for his rediscovery of a world of ancient theological evidence, but for his great zeal in copying and collecting all the old Christian inscriptions that he came across. Others followed him, like Doni, Gori, Muratori, Maffei and Marini, gathering mostly the inscriptions to be found above ground, only rarely adding from the vast stock of those that lay mouldering beneath their feet. It was among these men that appeared the idea of a *Corpus* of Christian inscriptions which should illustrate the ancient Christian life and serve as a weapon of polemic and apologetic warfare. Often planned and begun, it was abandoned as often as the similar enterprise in the province of heathen inscriptions, until the proper man came in the person of De Rossi.

The finest epigraphical training on Roman soil, an accurate

¹ Cf. Piper: *Einleitung in die monumentale Theologie*. Gotha, 1867.

knowledge of Roman topography and of the contents of every Roman gallery and collection, public or private, a consuming passion to piece together the splendid mosaic of the old Christian life, intelligent piety toward the very dust of antiquity, a patient, orderly, persevering mind, a vocation cherished by his earliest surroundings, and a special gift of divination, or moments of lightning-like introspection, in which the *disjecta membra* that lay before him took shape beneath his prophetic glance ere' they vanished again into quasi-nothingness, like the old *lucumones* beneath the glaring eye of an Etruscan sun,—such were some of the qualities that this young man of twenty brought to the herculean task that he planned, in part executed, and for the completion of which he has left the materials numbered and ordered like the great blocks of some unfinished Roman palace that encumber even yet the old marble Emporium by the Tiber.

In the science of Christian inscriptions De Rossi towers above all his predecessors by the knowledge of the sources and the superiority of his system. Under his direction the Roman Catacombs have yielded thousands of inscriptions, whole or fragmentary, and the sum of Christian epigraphic material has been more than doubled. He has himself visited innumerable sites above and below ground, and carefully copied the epitaphs, epigrams, dedications, and the like that are found there. The manuscript collections of Christian inscriptions have been catalogued by his skillful hand, numbered according to age and value, their additions to the body of inscriptions noted, and a great deal of valuable incidental information extracted from them for the formation and guidance of the Christian epigraphist. At the same time he was distinguished for his knowledge of all books, museums, correspondence, and men who could in any way throw light on his science. In other words, he had completely mastered the *heuretic* of Christian inscriptions; that is, he had surveyed the world of letters, located the whereabouts of his material and mapped out the roads and the paths that led to them. Precisely here is the other great merit of De Rossi as an epigraphist. He was a man of method. Not only did he make the most arduous preparations, remote and proximate, for his work, but he invented new principles of procedure, or rehabilitated old ones fallen into desuetude. When we watch the splendid—almost infallible—skill with which he conducts his epigraphic demonstrations, the studied moderation of every claim until conviction bursts spontaneous from the artful page, the marshalling of every available help, and the broad, serried march of all that sum of fact, suggestion, comparison and parallel—a sentiment of wonder clamors for expression, and we cry out, with the poet, that the art is even greater than the artist.

If chronology and geology are the eyes of history, they are especially serviceable in the science of inscriptions, which are necessarily laconic, compressed, and general in their speech. In the classic inscriptions the data of time and place are very often given, or, because of their great numbers and artistic perfection, can be calculated from extrinsic and intrinsic comparison. But such means of control are too often wanting in the case of Christian inscriptions, especially of the earlier times. They are rude in execution, long since torn from their surroundings, or scattered amid wreckage of every kind in the Catacombs. They are comparatively few, and rarely bear any chronological ear marks. Many a primitive Christian believed that this world *in maligno positus* was to be of short duration, and that human existence was, at best, but the *mora finis*, a beneficent staying of the divine hand uplifted to strike an unholy mass of corruption. The enthusiasm of Jesus Christ burned fresh, vivid, and sweet in their breasts, and they longed to be joined with Him whose remembrance alone made tolerable their life amid the seething sin and shame of heathen society. Hence they paid little attention to the aids of human chronology. With their eyes fixed on the celestial bourne, they counted the beginning of life to be the day of release from the prison of the flesh, and there is an echo of that other-world enthusiasm in many ancient acts of the martyrs that begin with *Regnante Domino nostro Jesu Christo*, as though they despised any other pitiful human measure of time. "*Qui sæculo nuntiasset se meminisset*," says St. Cyprian, "*nullum sæculi diem novit, nec tempora terrena jam computat qui aeternitatem de Deo sperat.*" On the other hand, the theological and social value of the Christian inscriptions depends largely on their age, and we are most anxious to know precisely those little items of years, months and days to which the primitive Christian was so indifferent. Much had been done before De Rossi by earlier Christian epigraphists, but he summed up and greatly increased their results in the first volume of the *Inscriptiones Christianae*.¹ There he submitted nearly fourteen hundred inscriptions, that bear some kind of a date (*nota temporis*), to a rigorous external and internal examination, from the famous Latin tablet of A.D. 71, down to epitaphs and epigrams of the end of the sixth century, the *terminus ad quem* of his great collection. In every case he develops the grave arguments that lead him to attribute a Christian character to the inscription before him and to assign it to a fixed year of the Christian Era. In his restitution of the text and in his rich commentary he displays on every

¹ *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romæ Septimo Saeculo Antiquiores*. Romæ, in folio, vol. i, 1861; vol. ii., part i., 1888.

page the qualities that ever distinguished him as an epigraphical writer—patient compilation of all the facts, orderly distribution according to immediate importance, vast reading, out of which he drew the newest and aptest parallels and luminous comparisons—those peculiar arguments which are to archæology what the syllogism is to metaphysics. So skillful is the demonstration, so perfect the distribution of lights and shades, so modest the claims for his victorious proofs, that one is tempted to fear that he is being influenced by a kind of personal magic on the part of his author and that he reads through a charmed haze in which objects have no longer their right proportion or color. Only, the amount of the new knowledge, the exactness of the references, the deference paid the writer by great masters of his own art, the natural persuasion of his argument, even his translucent Latin style, that reflects the noble candor of his soul, dispel the impression that such superiority not unnaturally awakens. The first volume of this monumental work contains, besides a long preface on the history of the collections of Christian inscriptions, an exhaustive treatise on the chronological data furnished by the inscribed monuments of Christianity, the eras, the *fasti consulares*, the cycles, solar and lunar, and the indications. In this masterpiece of difficult erudition he brings together from all sides, whatever may illustrate the use of these data, not only among Christians but in the surrounding society, and leaves a secure foundation for the labors of all future scholars among these *disjecta membra* of Christian antiquity. The plan of this great work includes all the inscriptions of the *Orbis Christianus* within the first six centuries of our era, taking them as the period when Christianity was co-equal with Græco-Roman culture. In the execution of this plan three dominant ideas are constantly kept in view, viz., the restoration of the inscriptions to their original sites, their chronological sequence, and the apologetic, theological or antiquarian use to be derived from them. To satisfy at once the demands of his science and the natural curiosity of the Christian world, he divides his collection into six great parts: I. The inscriptions bearing a certain date (this is the only part finished, and contains some 1374 inscriptions, besides fragments and addenda). II. The public-historical and sacred inscriptions, and all others which throw light on the doctrine, manners, etc., of the early Christians. III. The inscriptions arranged in geographical and topographical order, by nations, provinces, cities and cemeteries. IV. Those whose original location is unknown. V. The forged inscriptions and those whose early Christian origin is doubtful. VI. The contemporary inscriptions of the Jews. No doubt much of this vast plan work was finished by the *Maestro* ere he died, but as yet only two huge folios, the first volume and the

first part of the second, have appeared. We have already outlined the contents of the initial volume. The published part of the second is entirely taken up with an account of the mediæval manuscript collections of Christian inscriptions. Some of these MSS. date from the Carolingian era, and are sources of incalculable value, not only for the epitaphs, honorary inscriptions and other epigrammata they contain, but also for their topographical references to the ancient basilicas, cemeteries and localities of general interest to Christian pilgrims at Rome. They complete or explain the information already gained from the Catacombs or the lapidary galleries, and are themselves illustrated and perfected by the metrical anthologies of the same epoch.

Our Irish forefathers were foremost in the mania for these written remnants of antiquity, and no small part of ancient Christian inscriptional verse is found embedded in the metrical epigrams of Hibernicus Exul, Sedulius Scotus, the seventh century monks of Bobbio and others. In this volume we find printed or reprinted a great *corpus* of old manuscript codices from the eighth to the sixteenth centuries, in which is preserved much epigraphic material otherwise unknown or lost, and which represent the mediæval tradition of this science. These ancient manuscripts needed, indeed, to be reproduced at the head of the second part of the *Inscriptiones Christianae*, that the world might see what was already known of early Christian inscriptions ere the witnesses of the stones themselves was heard. It was all the more necessary, as too often the lapidary remains are mutilated and can only be pieced out by comparison with their ancient copies yet extant in the manuscripts, or with similar materials scattered through the Carolingian anthologies and itineraries. Only the epigraphists and the intimate friends of De Rossi know what labors this second volume exacted—how many long journeys, vigils, protracted studies and profound researches it cost to erect this vestibule of the temple of Christian epigraphy, truly grandiose and faultless in its outline. By far the greater part of the material contained in the ancient collections is metrical; hence the utility of the long preface on Christian metrical inscriptions which opens the second volume, and makes a most scholarly page on the origins of Christian poetry. For their models the primitive Christian had the great schoolbook of the empire—the divine Virgil, and more than one fine *cento*, thoroughly Christian in sentiment, was made up of odds and ends of the Mantuan. Not all the Christians were satisfied with such unadorned expressions of emotion as were conveyed by the *soror carissima*, *filia dulcissima*, *vivas in Deo*, etc. Some ambitioned a more resounding phrase, and borrowed with national piety the grave religious lines of their own pure poet, who was able, even after another thousand years,

to furnish thoughts and style to a Dante. That the Greek Christians showed metrical skill in their inscriptions is proven by several examples, notably by the epitaphs of Alexander Antonii, of Pectorius of Autun, and by the now famous Vatican epitaph of Abercius of Hieropolis, in Phrygia. The latter memorial brings us back to the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and shows us a section of the Roman world in the second century, where the Christians could fearlessly put up their funeral tablets by the roadside in a populous province and invoke the protection of Roman law for their immunity. The Christian use of *tituli rhythmici* at Rome and in Roman Africa during the third century is proven from texts pilfered out of Commodian and from the epitaph of the virgin Severa set up at Rome by her deacon-brother Severus. After the peace of the Church the art of the epigraphist was in honor, and the rude scratchings of the fossor gave way to the elegant lettering of a Furius Dionysius Philocalus, while the brief, endearing terms and the touching hatchments of the primitive loculi were cast into the shade by the sculptured sarcophagus and the florid piety of its engraved verse. The flowers of Christian poesy were now cultivated by men like St. Damasus, St. Paulinus of Nola, St. Gregory Nazianzen and Prudentius, and their sweet petals scattered over the graves of the dead. The cruel discipline of persecution was at last relaxed and somewhat of earthly attachment makes itself visible in the gentle, loquacious melancholy of these pious epitaphs. Soon they become the rage, and Sidonius Apollinaris speaks of the *naeniae epitaphustarum* as though the art was being overdone. In spite of the decay of letters it lived on, and the literary remains of men like Venantius Fortunatus, Ennodius and Arator explain the elegance of such sixth century epitaphs as those of Accia Maria Tulliana, and of the Anicii in old St. Peter's. But the Time of Ignorance came for the peninsula in the seventh and eighth centuries, when the skill of making ordinary Latin verse was lost, and even the Roman Church was satisfied with a rude and heavy prose, while the care of the old metrical traditions was abandoned to the barbarians of Spain, Ireland, England and Gaul. Isidore and Aldhelm, Bede and Alcuin, Dungal, Shiel of Liège, and the men of Bobbio, Hrabanus and Florus, and the Goth Theodulf, enshrine in their writings a mass of ancient Christian epitaphs, whole and fragmentary, sacred and mixed. So constant, indeed, is their use of earlier metrical materials out of epigrams, epitaphs and the like, that it is not easy to say when their verse is native inspiration and when it is borrowed from some metrical collection of the fifth century, or some scrapbook of a pilgrim just returned from his round of the holy places of Italy and the Orient.

IV.

The name of De Rossi is inseparably connected with the Roman Catacombs. For fifty years he labored in their depths with holy enthusiasm and rare intelligence. Under his directions the excavations took on a new character, and their results were shortly such as almost to justify the assertion that a new science had been created, and to rehabilitate a long-neglected branch of Christian learning. He was not the discoverer of the underground cemeteries of Rome: long before him, since the close of the sixteenth century, the whereabouts of many was known to the Roman authorities and the learned world. Still earlier, the long neglect of these venerable burial places had been broken in the fourteenth century by odd visits of pious friars, and in the fifteenth by the surreptitious meetings of members of the semi-pagan Roman Academy. Early in the seventeenth century they found a choice spirit capable of illustrating their mysteries and shrewd enough to seize the proper principles for the study of this great complexus of graveyards, in which time and man had worked almost irreparable havoc. This was Antonio Bosio, a Roman priest of Maltese birth, who devoted thirty-six years of his life to reconnoitering the location, number and monuments of the Catacombs. His great work, *Roma Sotterranea*, was not published till after his death, in 1632-34, and though it created much talk in the world of antiquarians and theologians, there arose no second Bosio to complete the task until the advent of De Rossi. In the meantime relic-hunters and curio-seekers travelled the huge network in every direction, without intelligence or sympathy for the architecture and the paintings, and did unspeakable harm by their reckless excavations and by their neglect to chronicle intelligently what they met with. The catacombs were treated as a huge quarry. Priceless inscriptions were taken away in cartloads and sawed into slabs to pave the Roman churches or inserted in the walls of private houses. Even as late as the early part of this century men like Marini could see epitaphs taken from the most celebrated crypts, without asking the excavators for any further details. The corridors, or *ambulacra*, were broken down and clogged up; the *lucernaria*, or shafts for light and air, were choked from above with refuse; rich material treasures disappeared without leaving any trace; the frescoes were detached from their original site, and perished in the transit to the upper air. Nearly every indignity was offered to these holy places in which a Damasus feared to repose even in death. The *custodi* of the last two centuries, and the learned Romans of the early part of this, were active and practical men who spent much time in the old cemeteries, but were chiefly taken up with the research of material for polemics or apologetics

or for minor objects of antiquarian interest. Even Padre Marchi, the guide and preceptor of De Rossi, was slow to adopt the new methods which this young man of genius urged on him from 1842.

The method of De Rossi was so simple that we wonder to-day how it did not suggest itself at a much earlier date. It consists in two things—topography and chronology. It was his habit to locate first, with certain helps at his command, the principal cemeteries usually situate along the old Roman roads leading out from the city like the spokes of a wheel. When he had done this, he looked up their history in the books, manuscripts and traditions at his command. Knowing their site and their history, his next object was to find the historical crypts or the great chambers in which the most illustrious martyrs were buried and venerated. There was a double reason for this, since, on the one hand, they were the keys to each necropolis, the subterranean *fora* to and from which all corridors finally led; on the other, they were most likely to contain entire the booty of epitaphs, paintings, sculptures, etc., for which he was likewise searching. It was a kind of mimic warfare, in which he directed his first efforts to the capture of the enemy's citadel and chief treasures. Once in a historical crypt, he made the most perfect inventory of its structure, the objects found, and of the process by which he got there. Nothing escaped his practiced eye, which read books written largely on walls and floors, where the ordinary observer stumbled or tripped at every step. His inventory made, he turned to a series of valuable documents come down from the Middle Ages, and found, invariably, new light upon the fragments of Christian antiquity that he had so patiently dug up out of the bowels of the earth. Little by little he connected the great crypts, drew up the plan of the connecting corridors, located the staircases that led from one floor of the cemetery to another, fixed the limits of the original burying-place and the successive additions and modifications, gained the old and the new levels, determined the relative situation of the whole underground structure, with the little churches or basilicas and sepulchres constructed immediately above ground, and took note of the geological formation.¹ It is easier to imagine than to describe the patience, memory, skill, erudition and self-command needed to carry on at once all these minor lines of one great plan. Whatever may be the difficulties of excavation in the open air, they are vastly increased when the work is carried on

¹ Michele de Rossi, the brother of the archaeologist, deserves most honorable mention whenever the latter is named. He was for fifty years an invaluable helper to his brother in all things pertaining to the geology, engineering, and architecture of the catacombs.

beneath the surface, where want of room, light, and fresh air are only the least of the obstacles, and not to be compared with the difficulty of control of workers and objects, the ease with which valuable indications may be skipped, and the constant fear lest the roofs sag, or sudden pits open up, or a ruined wall slide across the toilsome path of the fossor. Only half his work was done when the topography of a cemetery lay before his eyes pretty much as it looked when the traveller from the Orontes met the pilgrim from the Thames or the Liffey on the marble stairways that led from the richly-decorated over-ground basilica to the chief crypts, where lay the embalmed bodies of popes and martyrs, shrouded in gold brocade, entombed in marble sarcophagi, and surrounded by hundreds of venerators, amid the blaze of candles and the grave, sweet chant of the litanies. There was an equally difficult task to perform in fixing the respective dates to which all these things belonged. Independently of theological interests, there was a pressing scientific need that the chronology of the architecture and the art of the catacombs should be accurately determined. Before De Rossi, Bosio had grasped the idea that a true thread in this labyrinth was a correct notion of its topography, and De Rossi acknowledges this with that grateful delight which he always manifests when he can do honor to Bosio's judgment. But to De Rossi alone belongs the merit of fixing a certain chronology for the internal evolution of the cemetery system of Christian Rome. The principle of this chronology is set forth in the first volume of the "*Inscriptiones Christianæ*," and consists largely in the process *de notis ad ignota*. He collected the epitaphs that bore a certain date, and noted all their peculiarities. Hence he had a starting-point for similar epitaphs undated, and a first means of determining whether the crypt in which they were found dated from the second or the sixth century. The inscribed monuments thus classified enabled him to fix approximately the date of the paintings and sculptures on which they are often found, and with which they are often contemporary. The excavations and constructions of the catacombs could also be dated in the same way, since there is naturally the closest relations of time between them and the objects for which they were carried on. Another principle of his chronological method was the restitution, as far as possible, to their original sites, of all the ornaments and epitaphs that once decorated them. This gave him a *point d'appui* for the age of the corridor or crypt, surely as old or older than the monuments found in it. In such intricate and delicate processes the investigator can neglect nothing found on the premises or extracted from a certain class of ancient authors and traditions. Hence the extreme minuteness of the chronological demonstra-

tions of De Rossi. At this remoteness from the early Christian world, and at those depths in the earth, the student is like the traveller lost in the primeval forest, to whom every ray and sound and motion, however faint, are welcome helps. Moreover, he felt that he would never live to finish his great work, and he chose to leave the most elaborate examples of his method for the instructions of his disciples and as a fund of suggestions useful to future archæologists. Finally, he was an artist in antiquarian work, and he delighted in conquering the difficulties of some obscure date, and in unravelling with finished skill the last intricacies of a knot that lay unopened for centuries.

One charm of De Rossi's writings on the old Christian cemeteries is the skill with which he conducts his investigation on two lines—one the description of the actual condition and the remaining monuments of the cemeteries, and the other the use of a number of old documents, out of which, as out of a magician's hat, he seems to draw an infinity of useful facts that corroborate or illustrate, or fill up crevices and breaks, or serve as guides and finger-posts or danger signals—in a word, are a kind of a *vade mecum*, or familiar demon, which help him out of every tangle. The tombs of the martyrs, and especially the illustrious ones of Rome, excited deep interest from the earliest days. If the statement of the *Liber Pontificalis*—that Anacletus built a *memoria*, or little chapel, over the body of his predecessor, St. Peter—is not absolutely reliable, no one can gainsay the second century Roman priest, Gaius, when he shows us the public sepulchres of St. Peter and St. Paul, one on the Ostian way and the other *in Vaticano*.

We believe that there was a Christian cemetery in the latter place from the very beginning, and that a future time will show some illustrious Christian dead gathered round Peter and Linus and Anacletus under the bronze columns and the matchless dome of the modern basilica. The Roman Church had twenty-four or twenty-five underground cemeteries at the end of the third century—one for every ecclesiastical division or quasi-parish—and no doubt there was a list of them, their administration and expenses, as exact as that kept fifty years earlier by St. Cornelius for his priests, his poor, his widows and orphans. So systematic and precise, so easily bureaucratic is the Roman mind, that it is impossible to conceive that church at any date without archives, catalogues, lists and all the administrative paraphernalia of a governing body. The persecution of Diocletian burst like a prairie-fire over the Roman Church, and when she emerged, early in the fourth century, there was scarcely a stick of wood or a scrap of writing that remained. In the first three centuries the longest pontifical vacancy was about one year, during the persecution of

Decius. This time the See of Rome seems to have been vacant for six years, nor do we find any traces of that presbyteral government which took charge of church affairs in the time of Decius. There is, therefore, but the faintest hope that any new documents will ever turn up to illustrate the pre-Constantinian period of the ancient cemeteries of Rome. Their place is taken, necessarily, by later martyrologies, calendars, acts of the martyrs, writings of Popes, historico liturgical books of the Roman Church, and by old topographies and itineraries come down to us from the Carolingian epoch. Among the old martyrologies the most famous is that known as the Martyrology of St. Jerome (*Martyrologium Hieronymianum*). In its present shape it comes to us from Auxerre, in France, where it underwent a thorough remodelling in the sixth century. But it is older than that, and is surely an Italian compilation of the fifth century, out of rare and reliable documents furnished by the churches of Rome, Africa, Palestine, Egypt and the Orient. No martyrology contains so many names and indications of saints and martyrs of a very early period, and it is of especial value for the study of the catacombs, because it very frequently gives the roads and the cemeteries where they were buried and venerated in the fifth century, while the cemeteries were yet intact. By dint of transcription, however, and through the neglect or ignorance of copyists, the text has become in many places hopelessly corrupt, and the restitution of its dates, and local and personal indications has been one of the hardest crosses of ancient and modern church archæologists. Besides its very ancient notices of the cemeteries, this martyrology is of great value as embodying a catalogue of martyrs and basilicas of Rome that surely goes back to the early part of the fifth century, and perhaps a third-century catalogue of the Roman Pontiffs.¹ Several other martyrologies of the eighth and ninth centuries contain valuable references to the martyrs and the cemeteries, especially that known as the *Little Roman* martyrology, and which served as a basis for the well-known compilation of Ado.

Next in importance comes an ancient *Roman Calendar*, published between the years 334-356, written out and illustrated by a certain Furius Dionysius Philocalus, who, doubtless, had no idea that he would one day set wagging the tongues of two hemispheres. This calendar contains a list of the Popes, known formerly as the Bucherian Catalogue, from the name of its first editor, and the Liberian, from the Pope with whom it ends. The whole book is now known as the "Chronographer of A.D. 354." Besides this

¹ One of the last works of De Rossi was to prepare, in co-operation with Duchesne, the text of this most tangled and corrupted document for the latest volume of the *Acta Sanctorum* (1894).

ancient papal catalogue, the book contains an official calendar, civil and astronomical, lunar cycles and a paschal table calculated to 412, a list of the prefects of Rome (254-354) the only continuous one known, a chronicle of Roman history, the *natalitia Cæsarum*, and other useful contents, which have caused it to be dubbed the *oldest Christian Almanac*. It contains numerous traces of having been drawn up for the use of the Roman Church, and hence the value of two of its documents for the cemeteries. They are, respectively, a list of the entombments of Roman bishops from Lucius to Sylvester (253-335), with the place of their burial, and a *Depositio Martyrum*, or list of the more solemn fixed feasts of the Roman Church, with indications of several famous martyrs and their cemeteries. The importance of all this for the original topography is too clear to need comment. We will only add that closer examination of the ecclesiastical documents of the chronographer of 354 leaves us persuaded that they date from the third century and represent the location of the cemeteries at that time and the martyrs whose cult was then most popular.

In the latter half of the fourth century Pope St. Damasus (366-384) did much to beautify the ancient Roman cemeteries and to decorate the tombs of the most illustrious martyrs. As he possessed a fine poetic talent, he composed many elegant inscriptions, which were engraved on large marble slabs by his friend and admirer, Furius Dionysius Philocalus, already known to us as the calligrapher of the preceding document. The lettering used by this remarkable man was very ornamental, and as its exact like is not found before or after, it has been styled the hieratic writing of the Catacombs. In time these inscriptions were copied by strangers and inserted in various anthologies and travelers' scrapbooks or portfolios. Many of the original stones perished from various causes, but were piously renewed *in situ* during the sixth century. To these Damasan inscriptions De Rossi owes much, since any fragment of them in a cemetery indicates an historic crypt, and their copies in the manuscripts are links for the construction of the chain of history that connects each great cemetery with the modern investigator.

To the above *fontes*, or sources of information and control, De Rossi added the *historico-liturgical* literature of the Roman Church from the fourth to the eighth centuries—the period in which the bodies of the most celebrated martyrs began to be removed en masse from the catacombs, through fear of the marauding Lombards. Such are the *Liber Pontificalis* in its several recensions, the acts of the martyrs, chiefly the Roman ones, the calendars of the Roman Church constructed out of the missals or sacramentaries, the antiphonaries, capitularies of the Gospels, and

the like, in which not unfrequently there are hints and directions concerning the cemeteries and the martyrs of renown who were yet buried there. Finally, the *Maestro* extracted almost endless information from the old Roman topographies of travellers and the itineraries of pilgrims. Of the former we possess yet two curious remnants, entitled *Notitiæ regionum urbis Romæ* and *Curiosum urbis Romæ*, as well as a list of oils collected at the shrines of the Roman martyrs by an agent of Queen Theodolinda, and known as the Papyrus of Monza. An old Syriac text of the sixth century and a note on the *innumeræ cellulæ martyrum consecratæ* in the almanac of Polemius Silvius (449) complete the list of strictly topographical authorities. Certain itineraries of pilgrims from the seventh to the ninth century are not less useful as indicating the names and sites of the cemeteries, whether above or below ground, and what bodies were yet entombed therein, as well as the distances between the cemeteries, and their position relative to the great monuments of the city.

After the middle of the ninth century the historic crypts had been emptied and the bodies brought to Roman churches. Naturally, the written references to the catacombs ceased with the visitors, and a stray chapter in the *Mirabilia Urbis Romæ* or an odd indication in the *Libri Indulgentiarum* kept alive the memory of those holy places which once attracted a world of pilgrims. It is not easy to explain how one of the best of the old itineraries, referable to the seventh century, should have fallen into the hands of William of Malmsbury, and been by him copied into his account of the visit of the crusaders to Rome under Urban II. Neither is it easy to explain why the old itineraries of Einsiedeln, Würzburg and Salzburg make no mention of the tombs of such celebrated Roman martyrs as St. Clement the consul, Saint Justin the philosopher, Apollonius the Roman senator, Moses a famous priest of the time of Saint Cornelius, and many other celebrities of the early Roman Church, who were, in all likelihood, buried in some of the many Roman cemeteries. What the old pilgrims saw they related honestly and faithfully; more they compiled from guides now lost. They were not learned men, but pious travellers, anxious to benefit their successors, and unconsciously enabling us to form some exact idea of the solemn cultus that they once assisted at.

Such, in general, were the means which De Rossi had at hand for the reconstruction of that under-world of Christian Rome. But what pen will relate his patient research in all these old manuscripts and books? Or who can properly estimate his fine ingenuity of cross-examination, by which he laid bare the genesis of his authorities. Scarcely a library in Europe did he leave un-

visited in his determination to bring together every scrap of evidence as to the name, site and monuments of the Roman cemeteries, and his very wanderings diffused a new enthusiasm in every country, and brought new disciples yearly to the modest home beneath the shadow of the Capitol. It would take too long to enumerate all the results of his excavations in the Roman cemeteries. As far as published, they are to be found in the three great folios of his *Roma Sotterranea*¹ and in the *Bullettino di Archæologia Christiana*. The former includes only the results of work done in St. Callixtus and the little network of crypts and burial places connected with it.² His intention was to take up all the cemeteries in turn, and when death surprised him he was far advanced with the publication of his labors in St. Domitilla. When the cemeteries had been excavated and described, it would be time to think of the great synthetic work that Settele and others sighed for, and which he himself looked forward to in his dreams.³

¹ *La Roma Sotterranea Cristiana*, descritta ed illustrata dal Cav. G. B. De Rossi, pubblicata per ordine della Santità di N. S. Pio IX. Romæ: vol. i., 1864; vol. ii, 1867; vol. iii., 1877.

² The most famous of his discoveries in the cemetery of Callixtus are, besides the identification of it, the crypt of Lucina, the Papal crypt, with epitaphs and *loculi* of third century Popes, the crypt of St. Cecilia, the sepulchre of St. Cornelius, the arena-rium of St. Hippolytus, the epitaphs of St. Eusebius and of Severus, and the cemeteries of St. Soteris and St. Balbina, closely connected with that of Callixtus. I forbear to speak here of the paintings and sculptures or of the *varium suppellectile*, the lamps, medals, glasses, ivories and other sepulchral furniture of the Christians, in all of which St. Callixtus is rich. The prefaces of the *Roma Sotterranea* contain a complete history of the Catacombs, their origin and Christian character, their external vicissitudes, the order and method of their construction, their decoration and use as places of worship and the gradual decline of their fame. The results of the excavations, from an artistic and theological view-point, are well summarized in a number of works, notably in the *Roma Sotterranea* by Northcote and Brownlow, and in the *Epitaphs of the Catacombs*, by the same authors.

³ "It seems to me that the local and industrial labors of all Christian archæologists will one day complete the materials for a gigantic work, more beautiful and useful than could ever be hoped for in any minor synthesis of Christian antiquities. I have in mind an *Orbis Christianus*, illustrated by the monuments of the first six or seven centuries. Suarez in the seventeenth, and Garampi in the eighteenth, sketched a vast work, which should furnish us the series of the bishops of every church of Christendom. I desire to see a great Christian geography, in which the origins of each church, the first traces of the faith in each city and burgh, the proofs of its development and full flowering in every province and nation of the ancient world shall be collected and disposed in geographical and historical order. That day, the smallest shred of an old epitaph, the least bit of an old sculpture, will be witnesses of the highest importance as proving the presence of Christians in such a place and such a century. The very scarcity or even absence of these indications ought to nerve us to fresh research on the lines of history and topography. I hope the day will come when my *Roma Sotterranea* will be but a part of an *Orbe Cristiano Monumentale*, for which both I and other editors of the sacred monuments are but the purveyors of material or builders of particular parts."—*Roma Sott.*, vol. i., p. 82.

V.

Though De Rossi did not live to finish his *Roma Sotterranea*, he left abundant materials for that purpose in his *Bullettino di Archæologia Cristiana*, a serial publication, which was like a continuous appendix to the two great works we have hitherto been describing. It consists of five series—from 1863 to 1894—and is ornamented by a multitude of rare plates, maps, engravings, designs and inscriptions, that are found elsewhere with difficulty or not at all. A complete copy of it is now a precious rarity.¹ For a time it was regularly translated into French, first by Martigny and then by Duchesne. It is a workshop or storehouse of materials, in which De Rossi laid up countless essays, notes, disquisitions on the written and unwritten monuments and sources of Christian antiquity. There is scarcely a Roman cemetery unmentioned here. Those of Maximus and Hermes and Hippolytus, of Generosa, Ciriacus, Peter and Marcellinus, the Ostriano, and the cemeteries of Callixtus, Balbina and Agnes have many pages devoted to them, while much of his enormous and entirely novel studies concerning the cemeteries of Domitilla and Priscilla saw the light for the first time in its columns. The overground cemeteries and the suburban ones, as well as the various hypogei and crypts, Jewish and heretical cemeteries; that in the sacred grove of the Fratres Arvales, and even Mithraic grottoes—all find welcome here, where a great fund of observation and suggestion is massed up against future need. Epitaphs and inscriptions that in any way throw light on his cemetery work are copied here with extreme care, and largely commented on, whether Roman or foreign; early Christian or mediæval; classic, Damasan or *graffiti*; opistograph, forged or defaced.

It is interesting to read on one page an essay on the epigraphic traces of Christianity in Pompeii, on another of the inscriptions that enable us to trace back the Christian character of the Pomponii Græcini and the Acilii Glabriones to the first preaching of the faith in Rome, on a third of the invocations scratched by early Christian sailors on a great rock in the port of Sira, and on a fourth of the epitaphs of the African martyrs of Milevi and Sétif. The ancient Christian memories of SS. Peter and Paul, scattered through the old Roman world, were always dear to De Rossi, and he has noted a great number of them from the old bronze medalion of the founders of the Roman Church down to the Chair of St. Peter, on which there is a long and elegant dissertation. Famous sepulchres in the old Roman churches, like those of Junius Bassus and St. Cyril, drew from the *Maestro* a fund of lore on the burial

¹ *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, del Cav. Giovanni Baptista De Rossi. Roma, 1863-1894 (five series).

customs of the early Christians, while the origins of the earliest Roman churches exercised always a special charm on his antiquarian soul. He lingers long and lovingly over the early history of St. Clement and St. Maria in Trastevere, St. Prisca and St. Pudentiana, the basilicas of Domitilla, Petronilla, Nereus and Achilles, Cosmos and Damian, and the massive old fortress-church of the Quattro Coronati. The fourth century was in many ways a remarkable one in Rome. It saw the gradual transfer of the balance of power, both popular and legal, from pagan to Christian hands—an act which left its impress on the public monuments, like the Arch of Constantine, and in the history of the great Roman families. In the *Bulletino* we seem to watch this struggle as though it took place to-day, and there are few specimens of eloquence more simple and monumental than the essays on the cessation of the priesthood of the *Fratres Arvales*, and the Mithraic cult. On the other hand, we are initiated into some secrets of the wealth and prestige of the Roman Church, when we see how the families of the Aurelii, Flori, Uranii, Dasumii, Petronii, Cæcilii and Secundi embraced the Christian doctrines and placed at the disposal of the Pope the wealth inherited from long lines of pagan ancestors.

The theologian finds tidbits for himself in the new and unique vindication of Liberius by means of an epitaph, in the many antiquarian references to the cultus of the Blessed Virgin and to the institution of the consecrated Virgins, in the solid inscriptional proofs of the invocation of the saints, the veneration of the martyrs, whose autographs, trials, life in the mines, and proselytizing zeal are all exhibited to us as in a mirror. The lawyer reads with avidity the notes on associations at Rome, on the law covering burials, on the sepulchral jurisdiction of the pagan Pontiffs, and on the delimitation of public and private domain. There is strong food for the patrologist in the studies on the *Philosophoumena*, and for the historian in the numerous notices of ancient MSS. and the contents of old archives and libraries.

Here you will find, in distracting confusion, accounts of old archæologists and necrologies of later ones, summaries of standard publications on archæological subjects, and descriptions of Christian museums, notably that of the Lateran. The arts and the artists of the Middle Ages, especially those of Rome, their *biblia pauperum* and their elegant mosaics, their tessellated pavements and the slender grace of their campanili, tempted him at times from the strict limits he had set himself; he even wandered into the preserves of the Renaissance occasionally, and always returned with fresh laurels, envied by the masters in those departments.

De Rossi kept a watchful eye on the development of Christian

antiquarian science the world over. Wherever the Christian faith had left its imprint on a people, there must be more or less evidence of its workings. Thus he followed every find and excavation in Africa, Spain, Egypt, Greece, Sicily, Germany, France, Italy and the Orient, ever eager to add to the treasures of Christian remains. In this manner the *Bulletino* has become a great thesaurus for the study of early Christian art, and there is many a ravishing page in it on ancient crosses and medals, on rings and spoons, with Christian *siglæ*; on wine jars and oil bottles marked with the cross; on lamps and ornamental fishes; on Christian jewel boxes and eucharistic plates found as far away as Siberia; on the trinkets of a Christian empress and the collar of a Christian slave; on chalices and medal moulds, combs, bells, fragments of a marble lattice to separate the sexes in church; leaden plaques with exorcisms, and a multitude of odds and ends of a Christian life and culture that have utterly perished, save for these traces. Was ever more delicate homage paid to a religion than this pious retracing of the smallest vestiges of the past?

VI.

"*La pianta uomo cresce più robusta in Italia che altrove nel mondo*," says Alfieri, and De Rossi is a proof of it. The same man who dived in the bowels of the earth for the annals of the religious past was also one of the scribes of the Vatican library. Indeed, he was the dean of the little body of those Vatican *Scriptores*, who recall the monastico-literary brotherhoods of the Middle Ages, and the notaries, who have ever surrounded the Bishop of Rome from the very earliest days of Christianity. The cataloguing of the Vatican archives is an almost superhuman task; it has been some centuries in execution. The last six of the great folios, which contain the index as far as it is completed, are the work of De Rossi's hand and brain. I say brain, for it is no small task to read over thousands of manuscripts, often in the most wretched disorder, dispose them, describe them in scientific language, assign them to their proper epoch, note the peculiarities which distinguish them and the like.¹ That is a work demanding iron nerves and

¹ *Codicum Latinorum Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ*. Tomus X., opera et studio J. B. De Rossi, scriptore linguæ latinæ, adjutore Odoardo Marchetti.

Pars i. (Nos. 7245-8066); Pars. ii. (8067-8471). Tomus xi. (8472-9019), operam conferentibus Paolo Scapaticci scriptore linguæ Syriacæ et Al. Vincenzi scriptore linguæ Hebraicæ. Tomus xii. (9020-9445); Tomus xiii. (9446-9849). *Indices* tomorum xi., xii., xiii., *codicum Latinorum Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ cura et studio J. B. De Rossi, adjutore Josepho Gatti*. Pars I. Index auctorum, etc. Pars II. Index rerum locorum, hominum, etc. This huge manuscript inventory includes the Latin manuscripts added to the archives since the beginning of this century. Copied in splendid calligraphy, it serves the daily needs of the scholars who come to the archives from all parts of the world.

and self control no less than the most varied acquisitions and a critical acumen of the rarest kind. A double series of the Latin and Greek codices has already begun to issue from the Vatican press. Of the former, the Palatine (Heidelberg) manuscripts are the first to be codified in printed form. The two Stevensons, father and son, have charge of the work, and De Rossi has contributed an admirable sketch of the origin, evolution and strange vicissitudes of the Vatican Library and Archives from the dim dawning of the power of the Bishop of Rome down to the time of Innocent III.¹ The rest of the history of the library has been told by Father Ehrle in his history of its transfer to and return from Avignon, and the story of the archives in the last three centuries has been amply reviewed by M. Gachard, a Belgian scholar.

Few things strike the visitor to Rome more forcibly than the great and solemn mosaics of the Byzantine type which are to be seen in the oldest of the Roman churches. The art of mosaics is a peculiarly Christian product, and, as such, could not fail to engage the attention of such an enthusiast for Christian art as De Rossi. He began and carried on almost to completion the publication, in large folio volumes, of magnificent chromo-lithographs of the Roman Church mosaics prior to the fifteenth century. The collection is entitled "*Mosaici delle Chiese di Roma*."² Already twenty-three numbers of this unequalled work have been issued. Their price, however, puts them beyond the reach of ordinary purses. There is no keener delight for the student of the past than to turn over these wonderful sheets filled with figures of noble gravity. The enthroned Christ, the adoring elders, apostles and saints, the allegorical lambs, running waters, palms, etc., transport us almost to the gates of paradise. We forget their imperfections for the sublime serenity and recollection of these strange figures that haunt us forever from their station in the apses or on the façades, confessions, arches and porches of Rome's oldest basilicas and churches.

The minor writings of De Rossi cover a very widefield. His literary activity was of the most miscellaneous kind, though its objects were by no means heterogeneous; on the contrary, he always kept well within the lines of classic and Christian antiquarian culture.³ He was one of the mixed commission which

¹ *De origine, historia, indicibus scripturæ et bibliothecæ Sedis Apostolicæ*, Romæ, 1886. Printed as preface (pp. i.-cxxxii.) to the first volume of the printed Catalogue of Vatican Latin MSS. (*Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana: Codices Latini*).

² *Mosaici delle Chiese di Roma anteriori al Secolo XV*. Roma Spithöver, 1872-1892. Con testo bilingue, italiano francese: grandi tavole cromolitografiche (fasciculi i-xxiii).

³ His disciple, Prof. Gatti, has drawn up a chronological series of his minor writings, which is to be found in the *Album* of 1892. A full catalogue of all the known works

brought out the fine edition of the works of Bartolomeo Borghesi, by order of Napoleon III., and his intimate friendship with the great numismatist enabled him to draw from their correspondence much material for the elucidation of the knotty questions concerning the coins and inscriptions treated of in these splendid folios.¹ Valuable contributions from the pen of De Rossi are scattered through dozens of Italian and foreign learned periodicals and newspapers. Gatti counted, in 1892, over three hundred such essays, notes, reviews and the like, from a few pages in length to full book size. How much more of the kind is scattered throughout his voluminous, well-ordered correspondence of over ten thousand numbers! He was inimitable in the art of presenting the rarest information in terse, clear and limpid language, without seeking any other pathos than what naturally arose from the statement of unadorned truths, long denied, but at last vindicated. He seemed to have reached at one stride a certain perfection in these antiquarian essays, as any one may see who will compare his early treatises on *The Christian Inscriptions of Carthage* and *On the Christian Monuments that bear the figure of a Fish*, with his later *saggi* on the cancellation from an inscription of the name of a vestal virgin become a Christian, on the find of Anglo-Saxon coins in the Roman Forum, on the magnificent "Codex Amiatinus," or Bible of Ceolfrid, and on the *capsella argentea Africana*, or silver work-box found at Carthage and presented to Leo XIII. by Cardinal Lavigerie.

He was not merely a writer, an excavator, a hunter of Christian curios and oddments. The organizing talent was strong in him. Insensibly he drew men about him and assigned them tasks, by the fulfilment of which they have grown great in the world of letters. He thoroughly understood the value of modern expositions and congresses, and the need of giving forth to the people the safe conclusions of the scholar. At London and Paris he exhibited plans of the catacombs, and would have done the same at Chicago, if age and infirmities did not prevent him. The late international scientific congresses of Catholics had no better friend than this old archæologist. He understood well their spirit and their trend, and contributed to those of Paris (1888, 1891) the *primeurs*, or advance sheets, of his studies on the Cemetery of Priscilla, long his favorite field of labor, and in which the holy martyrs finally obtained for him some of the sweetest delights that a Christian scholar can hope to experience.² It is scarcely

that issued from the pen of De Rossi would fill over twenty-five closely-printed folio pages.

¹ *Œuvres Complètes di Bartolomeo Borghesi*. Vols i.-ix. Paris, 1862-1884.

² These studies are found in the *Comptes rendus* of the congresses, and in substance in the *Bulletino*.

possible to read with dry eyes the narrative of that long pursuit of fifty years crowned with such final success. In his language, bristling with technical terms, there is an intensity of devotion, an impatient directness of zeal, which betray the Christian investigator, as he tears off the heart of his mystery the last thin shroudings, and *knows* now what hitherto he firmly believed. There are few higher joys—certainly none more exquisite.

The strained relations between the Vatican and the new governors of Italy gave this quiet scholar more than one occasion to do good in a lasting though unostentatious way. Of late years ancient Christian monuments at Rome and elsewhere in Italy have been in great danger of destruction or defacement from the ignorance or ill-will of the actual authorities. The world-wide fame of De Rossi has enabled him to interfere several times, and with success, as in the case of the Church of the Quattro Coronati at Rome, and of Saint Severano, at Naples. It is mainly to his labor and skill that we owe the Christian Museum of the Lateran, one of the most fascinating collections in Europe. The idea, it is true, cropped out frequently during the last century, and various attempts were made to make the Vatican the centre for all such monuments. But under Gregory XVI., and later, under Pius IX., the Lateran palace was set aside for this grand enterprise, which was set in motion by Padre Marchi, and has since been conducted by his more illustrious disciple. In this great multitude of ancient Christian objects, nothing is more striking or more valuable than the long lines of Christian epitaphs and inscriptions, arranged in chronological and logical order, and illustrating, with undeniable veracity, the beliefs of the primitive Roman Christians, their discipline, rites, manners and habits, or life. In 1877 there were known over 15,000 such *monumenta litterata*, whole or broken, and De Rossi then asserted, in a public discourse, that their number grew at the rate of five hundred a year.¹

De Rossi was never a professor, but one will look in vain for a nearer approach in our day to the old Hellenic teachers or the great scholastics of the Middle Ages, who lived in the tenderest intimacy with their pupils. His real chair was in the depths of the catacombs or in the Lateran galleries, where he practiced his ingenious *ματευτική*, like Socrates on the banks of the Ilissos or in the streets of Athens, and forced the choicest minds to disengage for themselves the true spiritual realities that lay wrapped up with the fragments of epitaphs and the smoke-stained frescoes of those mysterious cities of the dead. He was always surrounded by a

¹ *Il Museo Epigrafico Cristiano Pio-Lateranense.* Roma, 1877.

little cosmopolitan circle of men, drawn to Rome by the fame of the great scholar. He met them off-hand in the streets, at home, on his walks, in the catacombs, at the Lateran, or St. Peter's. If teaching be the development of the human faculties through the effusion of acquired information, and the best method and incitement be the simple exhibition of the professor's own ways of gaining knowledge, then De Rossi was one of the greatest teachers of any age, and the grass-grown ruins of Christian Rome were his Portico. He fastened to himself with hoops of steel men of the extremest religious and national tendencies. Mommsen and Duchesne, Henzen and Bruzza, the English Stevensons and American Frothinghams, Danes, Russians, Austrians, Orientals, came in turn to experience welcome and instruction from this patriarch of Roman antiquities. He was a type of the true broadness and the solidly liberal sentiments of the Roman Catholic Church, which seeks on all sides the eternal truth and holds fast to it in all earnestness and charity. For years he conducted the public meetings of the Society for Christian Archæology¹ and the Venerators of the Holy Martyrs, and during the Roman season he might be heard once a month expounding in the catacombs, or within some ruinous old basilica of historic martyrs, before a motley crowd of sight-seers and pilgrims, the plans, the curiosities, or the history of this weird subterranean world.

VII.

"*De sculptore, pictore, fusore, judicare nisi artifex non potest,*" says the younger Pliny. Only one who approached De Rossi in phenomenal acquisitions could fitly judge of him as a *savant*. The preceding pages are some witness to the extent of his antiquarian knowledge, but no mere tale of his writings can convey a just idea of that mind, in which all the treasures of antique and mediæval culture were stored up with order and distinction. He had read every ancient author of the Greek and Latin world, whether pagan or Christian, and properly allocated what each conveyed toward his main object—the illustration of the origins

¹ The valuable proceedings of this body of disciples and admirers of De Rossi have been for some years published in the *Bulletino*, and form one of its chief attractions. The monthly meetings of the society usually draw many learned strangers and exercise a salutary influence on the study of Christian antiquities. The *Collegium Cultorum Sanctorum Martyrum* has its seat near the Vatican at the German Campo Santo, where is situate a community of scholars who dwell on the very site that Charlemagne acquired as a burial-place for his Franks who died at Rome. Among the writer's most pleasant souvenirs are the gentle courtesies and kindly helps which he once received from these gentlemen, several of whom are among the best Christian antiquarians of to-day. It would be tedious to distinguish, but the names of Monsignor de Waal, Wilpert, and Kirsch deserve a special mention.

of the Christian Church in the period of Greco-Roman civilization. Before him others had gone over the same field, but none with the same method and the same good fortune in the discovery of the precious wreckage of original monuments. The sum of the written remains of antiquity has been considerably increased in this century by happy finds or skillful restoration. Much light has been thrown on them—on the one hand by judicious criticism and tireless research, on the other by marvellous discoveries in the Orient—discoveries which do not redound solely to the credit of classic or pagan archæology, but are of priceless worth for early Christian life, literature and belief. De Rossi was contemporary with most of this progress, and it would not be too bold to say that he was intimately acquainted with every item of it that in any way interested the history of the city of Rome, the catacombs, the ancient Christian literature and the growth of Christian art.

As an investigator in new provinces of learning he was distinguished by his scientific probity and modesty. He was strictly honest in his method and in its application, never trying to gloss over weak points and never claiming for his arguments a cogency they did not possess. Nor did he attempt to read into his authorities conclusions that they did not justify. On the other hand, he was fearless and frank in maintaining what he recognized as the truth, and did not let himself be frowned down by pompous or malicious ignorance. His style was plain and direct, devoid of ornament—a very model of historic narrative. The fullness of his learning, the aptness of his illustration, the ingenuity of his parallel and comment, lent a strange eloquence to expositions otherwise dry and solemn as a column of figures. The Latin of De Rossi is grave, elegant, translucent, racy. It breathes strong with repressed feeling; it moves like the discourse of a judge, convinced where lies the truth, but anxious to deal fairly with both sides; it is the speech of one bred to the law, but whose mind dwells with delight upon the masterpieces of the golden latinity. It is the easy, correct, elegantly familiar Latin of the fine Italian scholar, equally removed from the stilted, involved speech of his Teuton colleagues and the straight discourse and irreverent brevity of certain English Latinists. Some of the prefaces to his great works will live long in the memories of all who love the large and flowing language of Latium, its superb majesty, its inimitable grace, richness and precision, its religious gravity, and its memorable annals of conquest temporal and spiritual. De Rossi was not without his trials, and his labors were at times misrepresented; but he found a firm protector in the papacy, as is illustrated by more than one little anecdote that circulates among his friends and admirers. Angry, uncharitable controversy pained his heart, saturated with the sweet religious peace

of the holy places in which he spent so many days and nights among the martyr dead who await the resurrection call. In this respect he was, indeed, *sine felle palumbus*. Though a man of firm Catholic faith, he was supremely amiable and courteous in his dealings with the many who did not share his belief, and among his sincerest mourners are men of the most extreme rationalistic training and views. He was a man of principle, faithful and devoted, known to the inner circle of cosmopolitan Rome as

"The kindest friend,
The best condition'd and unwearied spirit
In doing courtesies, and one in whom
The ancient Roman honor more appears
Than any that draws breath in Italy."

Livy says somewhere that in studying antiquity the soul becomes antique almost without an effort. And De Rossi had so long studied the growth and vicissitudes of papal Rome that his soul became drenched with loyalty to that race of mighty rulers who carried, and yet carry on within its walls the government of a world many times greater than had ever ambitioned the proudest Cæsar. The path of earthly honor was open to him, had he chosen to abandon the Vatican,

"U'siede il successor del maggior Piero."

But no temptation could corrupt his fine sense of honor, and he remained until death faithful to the successor of Peter and Fabian and Damasus, and Vigilius. His Roman lineage was a matter of just pride to him, and he sat for years in the Roman municipality as the protector of the old local interests of the city and the one scholar tribune whose veto even the fiercest of the new iconoclasts felt bound to respect. As long as men care for the history of the Eternal City; as long as her basilicas, her cemeteries, her museums and her varied literature interest them, so long will they recall the gentle and erudite spirit whose magic touch shed a white light upon all the old monuments of Rome, and whose scientific fiat caused the rubbish of ages to disappear, and gave over to the pilgrims of a new time and culture the roads and pathways closed for over a thousand years. Like some great mediæval architects, he finished none of the colossal enterprises that he began; but his methods, example and principles are perenduring, and have revolutionized archæological studies for many a year to come, while a generation of his youngest disciples will pass away before the *Collectanea* of the master are exhausted.

Memoria bene redditæ vitæ sempiterna. There is a pure, serene altruism in certain lives whose laborious course has been kept in

steady orientation to truth and beauty and goodness. Nor do we need to hear a George Eliot preach,

"The choir invisible
Of those immortal dead who live again
In lives made better by their presence,
And make undying music in the world,
Breathing us beauteous order that controls
With growing sway the growing life of man,"

Between the true doctrines of Catholicism and the natural aspirations and convictions of the human heart there is just such a minute, accurate, and catholic congruism as we should expect from the Divine Founder of that religion. Beneficent lives, however short, never melt into the general void, but shed forever a sweet aroma within the circle of their rememberers. This is the basis of the Communion of Saints, and it is broad enough to justify not only the interest of the Blessed Ones in our lives and their ever-present influences, but also the unbroken operation in human affairs of all choice spirits who have ever uplifted humanity or straightened out its tortuous pathway. So Dante saw on the greensward, outside the air that trembled over the fatal abyss, the pagan just, whose writings and great deeds yet have power to sway the souls of men :

*"In luogo aperto, luminoso, ed alto,
Sì che veder si potean tutti quanti,
Colà diretto, sopra il verde smalto
Mì fur mostrati gli spiriti magni,
Che di vederli in me stesso m'esalto."*

Homer and Socrates, and Plato and Aristotle, the martyrs and the doctors, and the great pilot-bishops in the Wandering of the Nations; the liberty- and justice-loving Popes and priests of the Middle Ages; the builders of Cologne and the Sainte Chapelle, and the founders of the Italian republics; Dante, and Columbus, and Joan of Arc; Milton and Shakespeare—all these live on forever in the hearts of men, in a sort of earthly apotheosis—household divinities that shield our spiritual hearths from a hundred devastating philosophies and corrupting examples, and preach, in season and out, the lessons of patience, unselfishness, mutual helpfulness, enduring enthusiasm and high idealism—in other words, that pure natural religion, which is the basis of Christianity, and which has been so long saturated with the light of the latter, that in its upper strata it is scarcely distinguishable from the revelation of Jesus. To this elect assembly belongs henceforth John Baptist De Rossi—an example, an inspiration, an index, a complete and rounded specimen of the union of learning and religion. Surely his many

merits won for him a speedy entrance into the heaven he worked for, and we may well believe that the last clouds of ignorance were quickly removed from his noble mind, and that

“The great Intelligences fair
That range above our mortal state,
In circle round the blessed gate,
Received and gave him welcome there,

“And led him through the blissful climes,
And show'd him in the fountain fresh
All knowledge that the sons of flesh
Shall gather in the cycled times.”

T. J. SHAHAN.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON.

THE CENTENARY OF MAYNOOTH COLLEGE.

IN the last week of the month of June, 1895, the national college of Maynooth will celebrate the centenary of its foundation. For a hundred years of divine favor and protection the bishops, clergy and laity of Ireland, united as they have ever been in the holy bonds of faith, will offer to God the homage of their gratitude and invoke at the same time His all-powerful aid for another century of struggle in His service. In the religious functions in the new college chapel, in a series of academic and literary exercises in the “Aula Maxima,” in the reunions of the former students of the college, in the proceedings of a select and international Catholic congress, in the concerts, addresses and all the other festivities of the celebration, the dominant note will be one of thanksgiving to God for His infinite mercy and goodness. In the course of a single century He has wrought a complete change in the condition of the Catholics of Ireland. During three terrible centuries He allowed their faith to be tested in the furnace of persecution, and by His grace they came triumphant through the ordeal. And now He has rescued them from the land of bondage. He has stretched forth His hand in power. The horse and the rider He hath overthrown. The chariots of Pharaoh He has cast into the sea, and the depths have covered them, and they are sunk to the bottom like a stone. The house of Aaron has hoped in the Lord and He has proved Himself their helper and protector. It is but

natural that they should praise and glorify Him in return, and prove, at the end of a hundred years, that their gratitude is of a profound and enduring nature. It is also usual, on such an occasion, to take a general survey of the history of the institution whose centennial festival is being celebrated. This will be done in the case of Maynooth, during the coming year, in a suitable and lasting form, by the most competent man for the work—the Most Rev. Dr. Healy, Coadjutor Bishop of Clonfert, and author of “Ireland’s Ancient Schools and Scholars,” who, at the request of the bishops of Ireland, has undertaken to write the history of his “Alma Mater.” Meanwhile, a brief review of the foundation, history and work of the college may serve to awaken interest in the event, particularly amongst those who sympathize, in America or elsewhere, with the cause it promotes.

Throughout the greater part of the eighteenth century the penal laws were enforced with the utmost rigor all over Ireland. The Catholic clergy were exclusively educated abroad. They came regularly from their churches and colleges on the Continent to encounter slavery or death in their native land. In order to minister to the spiritual wants of their afflicted countrymen they were obliged to assume all sorts of disguises, from the uniform of the soldier and the robe of the physician to the frieze of the peasant and the rags of the mendicant. In the midst of barren moors, in the dark recesses of woods, hidden in caverns or wandering from house to house through wild mountain glens, they pursued their sacred mission. In spite of every device for their destruction they succeeded in baffling their enemies and in maintaining schools for the instruction of Catholic children. Their success was so manifest that in the early part of the century the statute of William III. was frequently enforced against them. This gentle enactment decreed that “if any person whatsoever of the Popish religion should publicly teach school or instruct youth in learning he should be fined £20 and imprisoned without bail or mainprise.” And further to prevent the possibility of Irish Catholics getting any sort of instruction whatever, it was enacted “that if any one should go or send another into France, Spain or Italy to be educated, instructed or brought up, or should transmit money for the support of Irish students abroad, he should be disabled to sue in law or equity; to be a guardian, executor or administrator; to take legacy or deed of gift; to bear office of any kind, and should forfeit lands and goods for life.”¹ Later in the century, during the reign of Queen Anne, an old Act of Elizabeth was renewed, according to which “all Catholic priests and teachers should be banished the

¹ 7 Gul. iii., c. iv.

land, and if they returned they should be hanged, disembowelled and quartered.”¹ New and increased rewards were offered to all who should hand over a priest or teacher to the civil authorities. Spies and *priest-hunters* were the most favored officials in the country, and they sometimes even put dogs on the trail of their victims. The proselytizing “charter schools”² were erected and endowed to induce people to send them their children. In 1727 a law was passed that “no papist should be entitled to vote at any election, either for members to serve in Parliament or for any magistrates or officials of a city or town-corporate.” The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was offered up in hiding-places where there was least probability of interruption, whilst boys were posted as *videttes* to give the alarm in case the enemy appeared. During the vice-royalty of Lord Chesterfield an old house in Dublin fell on a crowd of hidden worshippers, killing them in the crash. All Europe was shocked at the catastrophe.

Such a state of things having prevailed till the century was far advanced, what can account for the sudden and extraordinary change that resulted in the foundation of Maynooth College, in 1795, by the Irish Protestant parliament, and its endowment at the figure of £8000 a year, for the education of the Catholic clergy? The causes, as may be expected, were manifold and varied. The proclamation of American independence, in 1776, taught English statesmen that the liberties of a people cannot be trampled on with impunity, and that sooner or later a Nemesis overtakes and punishes tyranny.³ The terrible revolution in France brought home to their doors the evils that might be expected from the rage of an infuriated populace. The shrewdest of English observers and publicists, Arthur Young, had warned them of their folly and pointed to its dangers.⁴ Their foremost statesmen, Pitt and Castlereagh, were planning the union, and had sinister designs in wishing to placate the Catholics. Nobody contributed a nobler part to the change than Edmund Burke, whose lofty and disinterested views were pressed upon the public in season and out of season. Amongst the leaders of the volunteer movement of 1782 Grattan and Charlemont were well-known sympathizers with the Catholics, and pressed their claims on their Protestant colleagues in parliament. The society of the “United Irishmen” was not less sympathetic. Theobald Wolfe Tone wrote in his private journal, on the 15th of August, 1792: “This country will never

¹ 8 Ann., c. iii.

² Warburton, Whitelock and Walsh, *History of Dublin*, vol. ii., p. 336.

³ See *L'Irlande Sociale, Politique et Religieuse*. By Gustave De Beaumont. Part I, p. 154.

⁴ *Tour in Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 50, 51.

be well until the Catholics are educated at home and their clergy elective.”¹ In the same year a general meeting of the society was held in Dublin, with the Hon. Simon Butler in the chair, and a report was submitted to the members by their committee, reviewing the disabilities under which Catholics labored in “education, guardianship, marriage, self-defence, exercise of religion, enjoyment and disposition of property, acquisition of property, and the rights of franchise,” and the committee wound up with the following solemn declaration, which was unanimously endorsed:

“Your committee submit to you this view of the Catholic Penal Statutes under the galling yoke of which your country has so long and so patiently languished—statutes unexampled for their inhumanity, their unwarrantableness and their impolicy. The legislature, which is instituted to cherish and protect the people, has here overspread the land with laws, as with so many traps, to ensnare the subject in the performance of the obvious and necessary duties of life. We recognize a free state in the right exercised by its inhabitants, of framing laws for the security of their liberty and property against all invasion; but with us the order of civil association is reversed, and the law becomes the foe, the ruffian that violates the rights and destroys the harmony of society. That this infamous system of political torture was not warranted by any alleged delinquency on the part of our Catholic brethren is notorious; for it was devised in times of profound tranquillity. We cannot, then, refrain from acknowledging with sympathy that signal forbearance in our oppressed countrymen which, joined with a laudable sense of shame in the persons insidiously authorized to give efficacy to their acts, has preserved our country from the calamitous consequences of such flagitious misgovernment.”²

The bishops, likewise, were eager to have an establishment for the education of their clergy at home. Many of their foreign schools had been broken up and their students disbanded. Some had been handed over to dangerous teachers, as a reward for questionable service rendered to revolutionary chiefs. At the great outbreak in 1789 it is computed that there were between six and seven hundred Irish students at different schools on the continent. Of these, 32 were at Salamanca, 30 at Alcala, 30 at Lisbon, 40 at Douai, 30 at Antwerp, 8 at Lille, 40 at Louvain, 30, 12 and 12 in three colleges in Rome, 70 at Prague, 10 at Toulouse, 40 at Bordeaux, 80 at Nantes, and 100 and 80 at two colleges in Paris. Smaller contingents were to be found at Sedan, Charleville, Rouen,

¹ *Memoirs of Wolfe Tone*, August 15, 1792.

² *The Report of a Committee Appointed by the Society of “United Irishmen,” of Dublin, to Enquire and Report the Popery Laws in Force in this Realm.* Dublin, 1792.

Bilboa, Madrid, Seville, Compostella and Capronica. The old Irish establishments at Evora, Tournay and Poitiers had already been dissolved. And now that disturbance prevailed all over Europe, the situation threatened to become more difficult than ever.

It is no wonder that such a variety of causes and motives should have brought about a totally new departure in 1795. In the early part of that year Earl Fitzwilliam was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, but on account of his advanced sympathies with the Catholics and the Irish people generally, he was recalled by the Duke of Portland in coalition with Pitt, and his place taken by Lord Camden. The new government was strongly opposed to the complete emancipation of the Catholics, but favored the establishment of a college for the education of their clergy at government expense. Accordingly a bill was introduced in the Irish parliament on the 24th of April, for the purpose of making provision "for the better education of persons professing the popish or Roman Catholic religion." The bill was presented by Mr. Secretary Orde and seconded by Henry Grattan. It passed both houses without any difficulty, and on the 5th of June received the royal assent. The general provisions of the bill are outlined in the preamble, as follows :¹

"Whereas by the laws now in force in this kingdom, it is not lawful to endow any college or seminary for the education exclusively of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, and it is now expedient that a seminary should be established for that purpose; be it therefore enacted, by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal and commons in the present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that the Rt. Hon. Viscount Fitzgibbon, Lord Chancellor of Ireland; the Rt. Hon. John, Earl of Clonmell, Chief Justice of King's Bench; the Rt. Hon. Hugh Carleton, Chief Justice of Common Pleas; the Rt. Hon. Barry Yelverton, Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer, and the chancellor or lord keeper, chief justices and chief baron of the said courts for the time being, together with Arthur James Plunkett, commonly called Earl of Fingall; Jenico Preston, commonly called Viscount Gormanstown; Sir Thomas Browne, Baronet, commonly called Viscount Kenmare; Sir Edward Bellew, Baronet; Richard Strange, of the City of Dublin, Esq.; Sir Thomas French, Baronet; Reverend Richard O'Reilly, of Drogheda, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend John Thomas Troy, of the City of Dublin, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend Thomas Bray, of Thurles, Doctor in Divinity; Rev. Boëtius Egan, of Tuam, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend Philip McDavett, of Strabane, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend Patrick

¹ *Statutes of the Irish Parliament*, vol. xvii., pp. 511, 513.

Joseph Plunkett, of Navan, Doctor in Divinity ; Reverend Francis Moylan, of Cork, Doctor in Divinity ; Reverend Gerald Tehan, of Killarney, Doctor in Divinity ; Reverend Daniel Delaney, of Tullow, Doctor in Divinity : Reverend Edmund French, of Athlone, Doctor in Divinity, and the Reverend Thomas Hussey, of the City of Dublin, Doctor in Divinity, and the persons to be hereafter elected, as by this act is directed, shall be trustees for the purpose of establishing, endowing and maintaining one academy, for the education only of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion ; and that the said trustees shall have full power and authority to receive subscriptions and donations to enable them to establish and endow an academy for the education of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, and to purchase and acquire lands not exceeding the annual value of one thousand pounds, and to erect and maintain all such buildings as may be by the said trustees deemed necessary for the lodging and accommodation of the president, masters, fellows, professors and students who shall from time to time be admitted into or reside in such academy."

The details of the enactment are then proceeded with, and the sum of £8000 is allocated for the work.

On the 28th of July the trustees met in the chambers of the lord chancellor in the old parliament house in College Green, and discussed the question of the site for the new college. Several proposals were submitted, but it was finally decided to accept the offer of the Duke of Leinster, who was anxious that the college should be established on his own estate, and who was prepared to grant fifty-four acres of land at a reasonable fee and at an annual rent of seventy-four pounds. Twenty additional acres immediately contiguous were subsequently obtained and added to the grounds.

The first president of the new institution was the Rev. Thomas Hussey, a native of Waterford and in every respect one of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of his time. Dr. Hussey was educated at the University of Salamanca, and at the end of his course entered the Abbey of La Trappe, with the intention of consecrating himself entirely to religious life. Pressure was brought to bear upon him, however, both by his old masters at Salamanca and by the authorities in Rome, to leave the cloister and follow a mode of life more suited to his talents and in which he could render signal service to the Church. Dr. Hussey obeyed, and at an early age was appointed chaplain to the Spanish embassy in London. Here he became a great preacher and a prominent figure in learned societies and in all associations for the promotion of Catholic interests.¹ He was the bosom friend of

¹ *Life of Johnson*. 8vo. Vol. iii., p. 557.

old Dr. Samuel Johnson, in connection with whom Boswell speaks of him as "a man eminent not only for his powerful eloquence as a preacher, but for his various abilities and acquirements."¹ In the year 1792 he was admitted a "Fellow of the Royal Society of London." A short time before, he had been requested to go on a mission to the Holy See by the Committee of English Catholics, of which Lords Stourton and Petre, Mr. Wilkes, Mr. Throckmorton and Sir H. Englefield were the most prominent members. He enjoyed the closest friendship and confidence of two successive Spanish ambassadors, Prince Mazinano and the Marquis del Campo. Whilst enjoying their hospitality he frequently met Lord Chatham, the Duke of Portland, Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox. But he was particularly indebted to his position here for his first acquaintance with the illustrious Edmund Burke, who became, from that forward, his closest friend and most powerful ally in all his efforts for the relief of his fellow-Catholics. King George III, used also to appear at the embassy from time to time, and on one such occasion he had a long conversation with Dr. Hussey, who made on him so favorable an impression that he afterwards employed him on important business of state in several messages to the Spanish government, in conjunction with a certain Mr. Cumberland. This gentleman became quite jealous of the attentions that were paid in Madrid to his distinguished companion, and describes him, in a fit of vindictive jealousy, in his memoirs, as a man who had left no earthly passion behind him in the cloister, but, nevertheless, "a man of talents, nerve, ambition, intrepidity—fitted for the boldest enterprises." Charles Butler, in his "Memoirs of the English Catholics,"² tells us that on another occasion Dr. Hussey accompanied Sir John Webb on a visit to Vienna. "During their stay a negotiation was on foot between the emperor and the porte, and the wise Joseph, in his usual manner of affecting great business, was forever saying, 'J'attends un courier de Constantinople.' This was so frequently repeated that it became a kind of *soubriquet* among the courtiers. At this time the treaty for peace between England and America was first opened. It happened that, on receiving some propositions from America, the House of Commons adjourned for a fortnight. 'Mais done,' said the emperor to Dr. Hussey, 'expliquez moi cela.' You are panting and dying for a peace. At length she advances towards you, and instead of running up to her and embracing her, you adjourn for a fortnight. 'Expliquez moi donc cela.' 'Mais

¹ *Life of the Rev. Arthur O'Leary.* By Rev. Thomas R. England. P. 230. London, 1822.

² *Memoirs of the English Catholics.* By Charles Butler, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn. Vol. iv., pp. 438, 441.

cela est clair,' said Dr. Hussey, 'c'est que nous attendons un courrier de Constantinople.' The expression got into the mouth of every one, and for three days Dr. Hussey was the first man in Vienna."

Notwithstanding his worldly associations, Dr. Hussey was ever a profoundly religious man—the same, in fact, who wished in his early years to be buried forever in the monastery of La Trappe. His zeal in the Catholic cause knew no limits, and his zeal was surpassed only by his success and the wonderful charm of his personal influence over the statesmen and people of the world with whom he was brought into contact. He was, accordingly, designated, by the nature of things, as the fittest man to carry out the new project of the government at Maynooth. He was left, however, only for a few years at the head of the infant establishment, when he was promoted to the bishopric of Waterford. His reign in the episcopal ranks was of very short duration, but was signalized by his presence at the conferences held in Paris for the drawing up of the concordat between the first Napoleon and Pope Pius VII., at which he acted in conjunction with Cardinal Gonsalvi and the Archbishop of Corinth, receiving for his diplomatic delicacy and tact the thanks of the emperor as well as those of the Pope. His health was shattered by the annoyance he got on account of his first pastoral letter, which was a splendid, manly exposition of Catholic doctrine, rights and duties, and a bold denunciation of the oppression to which Catholics, and particularly the Catholic soldiery in his diocese, were subjected. Whilst his former friends in government now turned upon him and attempted to crush him, he did not receive from his colleagues in the episcopate the support which he expected. Burke alone remained faithful to him to the last. "From the moment that the government who employed you betrayed you," he wrote, in 1797, "they determined at the same time to destroy you. They are not a people to stop short in their course. You have come to an open issue with them. On your part, what you have done has been perfectly agreeable to your position as a man of honor and spirit."¹ Such language from the most honored statesman and distinguished writer in Europe was no small consolation for the loss of other friends.

Such was Dr. Hussey, the first president of Maynooth College. "His name," wrote Charles Butler, "will long live in the memory of his friends—a man of great genius, of enlightened piety, with manners at once imposing and elegant, and of enchanting conversation. He did not come into contact with many whom he did not subdue; the highest rank often sank before him."²

¹ See Plowden's *Historical Review of the State of Ireland*, vol. ii., part ii., p. 290.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 439.

The first vice-president of the college was the Rev. Francis Power, who had been educated in Paris and had become canon and archdeacon of the Cathedral of Avignon. The Rev. Maurice Aherne was appointed professor of dogmatic theology. He was a native of Kerry, studied at Paris, where he obtained his degree and acted for a while as professor of theology in the university. The Rev. Thomas Clancy was nominated to the chair of Holy Scripture. He was a graduate of the University of Prague, where he had been also a professor for some time. The chair of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy was given to the Rev. Peter Delort, who had emigrated to England, during the revolution. He was a native of Bordeaux. The Rev. Andrew Darré was appointed professor of logic. He was a native of Montau in Gascony, and had been professor in a college at Toulouse. To the chairs of Rhetoric, Humanity, and English, the Rev. John Chetwode Eustace, James B. Clinch, Esq., and the Rev. Charles Lovelock were named. Of these, the one who became best known in the literary world was, undoubtedly, the Rev. John C. Eustace, author of the "Classical Tour in Italy," the following memoir of whom appeared in the "Gentleman's Magazine," of October, 1815:

"Recently died at Naples, of a fever, the Rev. John Chetwode Eustace, the accomplished author of the 'Classical Tour in Italy.' Few works of equal magnitude and on a subject unconnected with the feelings or occurrences of the day, ushered into the world by no patronage and written by a man till then known to a small circle only of friends, ever experienced so rapid a diffusion or acquired to the author so sudden and extended a reputation. His acquaintance was sought by almost all persons in this country distinguished by rank and talents, and their expectations of pleasure and profit from his society were more than equalled by the amenity of his manners. Dignified without pride, cheerful without levity, in his intercourse with the world, he never for a moment lost sight of his sacred character or its duties, which he fulfilled without ostentatious display or affected concealment. Although his 'Tour in Italy' exhibits not only his extensive acquaintance with Catholic and polite literature, but his cultivated and refined taste, yet the spirit of Christian morality and benevolence which breathes in every page, is, perhaps its most striking feature. In that 'Tour,' which was performed in 1802, he was accompanied by the present Lord Brownlow, Robert Rushbrooke, Esq., and Philip Roche, Esq. In June, 1814, he accompanied Lord Carrington in an excursion to Paris; and a short time after, appeared his Letter from Paris, in which he gave a very interesting description of the French capital, its public buildings and works of art. In 1814 he published 'The Proofs of Christianity,'

which are compressed within a small compass and explained in plain easy language, in the interrogatory form. The chief arguments in proof of Christianity are here arranged and examined under twelve heads: prophecy, miracles, the preaching and styles of the Apostles and Evangelists, the sublimity of the Christian doctrine, the purity of Christian morality, its efficacy in the reformation of mankind, the testimony of martyrs, the conversion of the world, the perpetual duration of the Church, the immutability of the Christian doctrine, the accomplishment of the predictions of the Gospel, the fate of the Jews. In this valuable tract, technical expressions and controversial allusions are avoided; and it is well calculated, as the pious author intended, to promote the general cause of Christianity."

With its small but distinguished staff of professors, Maynooth College was soon in working order. It began with something like fifty students; and it was with difficulty even that this small number could be accommodated. The old house originally taken, could barely provide room for twenty students in addition to the professors. The remainder had to lodge in the little town and attend their classes in the college. But soon new buildings were erected. Parliament made the grant of £8000 an annual concession. The sum was increased by the united British Parliament in 1808 to £9500. A legacy of £500 a year was obtained in 1803 from Lord Dunboyne, who had been Bishop of Cork, and who had apostatized and got married, but repented on his deathbed and devised all his property to the new institution. A lawsuit ensued in which Lord Dunboyne's relations pleaded undue influence and claimed that the will was null and void on account of the property laws against Catholics. John Philpott Curran acted as the advocate of the Bishops, with the result that a compromise was arrived at and the suit compounded. More ample and just provision was made for the material wants of the college in the year 1845 by the government of Sir Robert Peel. The yearly endowment was raised from £9500 to £26,000; and an additional £30,000 was granted to provide buildings suited to the high purpose for which the college was instituted. When the Prime Minister submitted his bill to Parliament a fierce storm of bigotry was raised all over the kingdom.¹ It shrieked itself hoarse, but had practically no other effect. Once ministers had made up their minds they could not be shaken and they were liberally and loyally supported. The debates on the several readings of this bill are amongst the most remarkable in the history of the British Parliament.¹ The measure was fiercely contested. Representatives of the old school

¹ See Hansard's *Parliamentary Debates*, May, June, and July, 1845, *passim*.

of oratory and of the new took part in the struggle. Sir Robert Peel, Lord Palmerston, Lord John Russell, Monckton Milnes, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Macaulay, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, Mr. Shiel, Sir C. Napier, Lord Edward Bruce, Lord C. Wellesley and Mr. Wyre, championed the cause of Maynooth and the increased grant, whilst its opponents counted amongst their number Mr. Disraeli, J. C. Colquhoun, Sir H. Douglas, Lord Hillsborough, Mr. Newdegate, and Sir C. L. Inglis. Notwithstanding the opposition from within and from without, the bill passed the House of Commons by over a hundred of a majority. Its fate in the House of Lords was equally successful. Championed by the most respected and popular of the members of the aristocracy, it received serious opposition only from the Bishops of the Established Church and a small knot of high and dry Tories and bigots. The Duke of Wellington, now in his seventy-sixth year, gave it his hearty support. The Duke of Leinster, the Marquis of Normanby, the Marquis of Landsdowne, the Earl of Rosse, Lord Brougham and Lord Campbell made eloquent speeches in its favor, whilst the opposition was left to such minor lights of debate as Lord Clancarty, the Earl of Winchelsea, and the Protestant Bishops of Cashel, Landaff and London. Its triumph secured for Maynooth the most prosperous spell of its existence, between 1845 and 1869. In the latter year the Protestant Church was disestablished in Ireland by the government of Mr. Gladstone, and, notwithstanding the ridiculous inequality and want of parallel between the two cases, the annual grant was also withdrawn from Maynooth College.¹ A capitalized sum, amounting to fourteen years' purchase, was, however, handed over to the trustees. It amounted to £364,600, and this sum, carefully invested and guarded by the bishops, has been the material mainstay of the college ever since. Though very inadequate to supply the wants of the college it has been supplemented from time to time by charitable members of the clergy and laity, who naturally felt that their money could be applied to no more noble and far-reaching purpose than the education of a priest.

It must not be supposed that these important changes in the fortunes of Maynooth College were allowed to pass unnoticed by the enemies of Catholicism. A regular tide of bigotry and hatred poured its abuse in torrents on the establishment. Indeed, the anti-Maynooth literature of the century would fill a good-sized library. These works provoke now only a smile of mingled astonishment and satisfaction. It is hard to believe that at a period so recent such diatribes could have been indulged in, and it is something to be thankful for that the man who would attempt to

¹ Hansard's *Parliamentary Debates*, May and June, 1869, *passim*.

renew such methods of controversy at the present day would be excluded from all decent society in these countries. We might well afford to pass over in pity the ravings of these scribblers, were we not tempted to cull from them a few gems for the amusement of our readers. One of the earliest of the band was a Protestant barrister, named O'Driscoll—an apostate, we suspect; for apostates are generally got to do shady work. This individual published a book, in 1823, entitled "*Views of Ireland, Moral, Political and Religious*," in which we come across the following specimen:¹

"The system of education adopted at Maynooth is such as to impregnate the minds of the students with sentiments of the bitterest hatred to Protestants and the most intense detestation of England. Imbued with the sanguinary spirit of intolerance and artful equivocation, it is scarcely to be wondered at that they have constantly joined in all sorts of political movements and in every species of popular agitation; that their character is one for turbulence, for sedition and immorality; that they carry out to the letter, in their practical life, the doctrines contained in the notes of the Rhemish Testament, which declare it essential for a Roman Catholic to believe that it is lawful to murder Protestants and break faith with heretics. Primed to the full with bigotry, intolerance and hatred of England, the Maynooth priest forms, in the parish in which he is located, a nucleus of outrage upon Protestants, disaffection towards England and bitter animosity and discord. His breast, a dark concentration of sectarian fury, dogmatical self-deification and superstitious zeal, inoculates the whole neighborhood with the deadly virus, and the public mind of Ireland is thus manacled in the grinding fetters of spiritual vassalage."

In 1836 the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel published his "*Notes of a Tour in Ireland*." During this precious tour he was hospitably received and entertained in Maynooth College, which he expressed a desire to see. The courtesy and hospitality of the president and professors were repaid by such choice language as the following:

"I could not but reflect on the prodigious moral power lodged within the walls of that rough-cast range of buildings. What a vomiting of fiery zeal for worthless ceremonies and fatal errors. Thence how the priestly deluge, issuing like an infant sea—or, rather, like a fiery flood from its roaring crater—pours over the parishes of Ireland, to repress all spiritual improvement by their anti-Protestant enmities."

In the year 1841 a Barrister of the Inner Temple, in London, named James Lord—a man who seems to have had little to do at

¹ *Views of Ireland, Moral, Political and Religious*. 1823. Vol. ii., p. 3.

his profession—published a volume on Maynooth, its grant and its teaching.¹ The volume is so full of the cant in vogue in these days that it is not worth wasting space upon. Suffice it to say that all the delicate compliments paid to the “Romish priesthood” by his predecessors in the beautiful art are repeated and commended. But the greatest storm raged in the ranks of this ill-assorted army during the passage of the bill of Sir Robert Peel, in 1845. It was then that the volume entitled “Maynooth Tried and Convicted” appeared. Another warlike production was entitled “The Continuation or Increase of any Grant for the Education of the Romish Priesthood a National Sin.” Basketfuls of pamphlets on the wickedness of the morality taught “in the Romish Seminary of Maynooth” were distributed gratis all over the country. In these, Thomas Aquinas, Bellarmine, Menochius, Maldonatus and Dens were held up to the execration of mankind by ridiculous and, for the most part, ignorant and anonymous nobodies. Finally, a great conference of the opponents of Maynooth was held at Exeter Hall, in London, where all the rampant orators from England, Ireland and Scotland congregated to denounce the government and its project. Here Wesleyans and Baptists took their stand beside the ministers of the established church. Tresham Gregg went over from Dublin; Scotland sent delegates from its “free kirk”; the University of Cambridge supplied the organizers. For several days the whole crowd revelled in Exeter Hall, denouncing popery, intolerance (!) and Maynooth.² They were allowed to let off steam in peace. The most representative and respected members of their own sects kept aloof from the proceedings, which had the good effect of concentrating the attention of the world on the narrow-minded bigotry of the delegates themselves and provoking a corresponding amount of ridicule and contempt. One of the last of the class of adverse critics of Maynooth College was a certain Sir Francis Head, who visited the college about the year 1852, and in an octavo volume entitled “A Fortnight in Ireland,” published soon after, devotes considerable attention to the college, its professors, students and work. It would scarcely be fair, however, to class him with the undiscerning crowd with whom we have hitherto dealt. His criticisms are relieved by some generous passages and are distinguished by an almost complete absence of the rabid and unscrupulous misrepresentations that distinguished the earlier works. They were such,

¹ *Maynooth College; or the Law Affecting the Grant to Maynooth, with the Nature of the Instruction there Given.* By James Lord, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

² See *Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference of 1845.* By Rev. A. S. Thelwall, of Trinity College, Cambridge. London, 1845.

nevertheless, as to draw from the well-known Dr. Murray a scathing and well-merited castigation.¹

Whilst all the storms were blowing outside, the work of sanctification and of moral and intellectual progress was peacefully carried on in the halls and oratories of the college. In the first half of the century two of its professors stood out in special prominence. They are Louis Ægidius Delahogue and John MacHale. Dr. Delahogue was a French refugee, who had been a doctor of the Sorbonne and had taught theology for some time in the University of Paris. From 1832 to 1835 he published in Dublin several important theological treatises which, in these days, were of the greatest possible benefit to his students. They were chiefly "De Mystério Trinitatis," "De Incarnatione Verbi," "De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ," "De Sacramentis in Genere," "De Eucharistia," "De Religione." Dr. Delahogue has sometimes been accused of Gallican tendencies in his teaching in Maynooth. That, however, is a controversy which we could not open here and have no desire to open anywhere.

Dr. MacHale, who afterwards became Archbishop of Tuam, *clarum et venerabile nomen* published in 1828, his "Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church," in two volumes. It is a masterly work and presents a splendid vindication of Catholic doctrine against the Protestant errors most prevalent at the time. From the year 1826 to 1864 the scientific department of the college was represented by a man of original and inventive genius and of great piety, Dr. Nicholas Callan. His chief triumphs in the scientific departments were 1st, the invention of a species of galvanic battery of great power, in which lead was substituted for the platina of Grove's and the carbon of Bunsen's batteries, and in which the voltaic current, excited by a mixture of concentrated nitric and sulphuric acid, far surpassed in power anything that had hitherto been produced; 2d, the invention of an "induction coil of great power," which held its ground for eight years as the best of its kind in Europe, and which the author fully described in an article in the "Philosophical Magazine," of June, 1863. A description of the battery was also read for Dr. Callan before the "Royal Irish Academy" by Sir Robert Kane, on the 10th of May, 1847.

In later times, and to speak only of those who have gone to their reward, two other names stand prominently forward as having long been connected with Maynooth. They are those of Dr. Charles William Russell, uncle of Lord Russell, of Killowen,

¹ *Essays, Chiefly Theological.* By Rev. Patrick Murray, D.D. Dublin, 1852. Vol. iv., pp. 27, 31.

the present Chief Justice of England, and Dr. Patrick Murray, whose name we have already mentioned. As an accomplished scholar Dr. Russell had a European reputation. As a refined and courteous gentleman he was well-known in England and Ireland; but his holy life, his genial character, his playful wit, his wonderful power of endurance at work, his personal influence in every-day life—these were things that were known only to his colleagues and to the students with whom he lived and in the private circles that claimed him as an intimate friend. In his "Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti," all his powers of scholarship are brought into play. An intimate friend of Cardinal Wiseman, he became a constant contributor to the *Dublin Review* for a great number of years. When the State papers of the reign of James I. were to be published, the British "Master of the Rolls" fixed upon Dr. Russell as the most capable and conscientious man in the United Kingdom to perform the task. Of his long and affectionate intercourse with Cardinal Newman we need say nothing. The cardinal himself has put on record his indebtedness to him by dedicating to him his "Loss and Gain," and by the passage in his "Apologie," in which he says:

"The last letter which I have inserted is addressed to my dear friend, Dr. Russell, the present President of Maynooth. He had, perhaps, more to do with my conversion than any one else. He called upon me, in passing through Oxford in the summer of 1841, and I think I took him over some of the buildings of the University. He called again another summer on his way from Dublin to London. I do not recollect that he said a word on the subject of religion on either occasion. He sent me at different times several letters; he was always gentle, mild, unobtrusive, uncontroversial. He let me alone."¹ During the period that Dr. Russell occupied the position of President of Maynooth, he displayed great energy and taste in promoting the material welfare of the college. It was mainly owing to his exertions that the foundation of our present college chapel was laid in 1875 and that the building was carried so rapidly to completion.

Dr. Murray was a very different man from Dr. Russell; not different in piety or goodness, for he, too, was a man of the most saintly character; but different in his general method of viewing things and dealing with them. Dr. Russell was bashful and kept clear of controversy as far as he conscientiously could; but Dr. Murray had the ardor of a real combatant and seemed to revel in the fray. His splendid treatise, "De Ecclesia," in which he deals with the most specious arguments of Protestant writers, won him a place amongst the first theologians in the Church in his day.

¹ "Apologia Pro Vita Sua," by J. H. Newman, D.D. 8vo. ed., p. 317.

But his fame does not rest on that work alone. His treatise, "De Gratia," is found still a useful handbook, and his "Essays Chiefly Theological" prove him to have been not only a man of deep learning, but also of wide and varied culture. He had made a special study of English literature and had a splendid command of the English tongue. This free acquaintance with the best models in literature give a certain charm to his works and make them pleasant to read even at considerable interval of time. This, we venture to predict, is more than is ever likely to be said of the great mass of biblical, theological, and general ecclesiastical literature of a later period, which, in form and outline, seems every day to display less and less of the native inward symmetry, light and beauty of the subject.

Dr. Murray was always a courteous and fair-minded opponent, but whenever he suspected a want of good faith or saw an index of groundless and inveterate prejudice against the Church on the part of his opponents, he struck out with little ceremony and drew upon a rich and well-stored arsenal of invective, ridicule and scorn, which silenced and confounded his enemies. Thus a certain Dublin lawyer, named James Whiteside, who afterwards became Chief Justice of Ireland, visited Italy in the year 1847 or 1848 and published a work on his travels, in three volumes, in which he revives every scandal and calumny that the malice of centuries had trumped up against the Papacy, from the sufferings of Beatrice Cenci, immortalized by the painter, Guido Reni and the poet Shelley, to the intrigues of Massimo D'Azeglio, and the administration of Pope Pius IX.

Dr. Murray does not think it worth while to deal very seriously with an author of this kind, who spreads himself over three volumes with inflated self-satisfaction and lays down with dogmatic intolerance a series of facts and deductions which genuine and impartial history had long since proved to be mere fiction and nonsense. The Maynooth professor can, therefore, not be blamed if he writes as follows, on the appearance of a fresh volume of Whiteside's "Italics."

"The readers of Carlyle's works are familiar with a class of persons, whom in his own rather quaint, but not less picturesque, manners, he designates "Windbags." Now the writer of the book before us is a genuine specimen of the windbag class. This Mr. Whiteside published, some time ago, a work on Italy in three volumes, characterized in no small degree by three qualities often enough combined together in the same subject—ignorance, impudence and excessive prejudice. . . . Mr. Whiteside may be a very effective orator in Green Street or in the Four Courts, but we can assure our readers that his essays on Italian affairs indicate a very

small degree of mental vigor and what, for an orator, would seem even more strange, a very small degree of literary culture. He raves like a maniac against the Pope, whom, with genuine impertinence and arrogance of a certain class of Dublin Protestants, he scornfully designates "the priest." He stamps, screams, foams, chokes, in the fervor of his anti-papal madness. He is exceedingly angry with the French for saving Rome from the domination of some thousands of robbers and assassins. Thus he discourseth"—etc.

If Dr. Murray had not been a theologian, if he had not consecrated all his energy and thought to the defense of Catholic truth and to the engrossing work of teaching, if he were less conscientious in all that concerns the sacred character of a priest, there is little doubt that he could easily have acquired a place amongst the very foremost of the literary men of his time. As it was, the call of his heart was for higher things and a more solid fame. It was only during his holidays that he allowed his vivid imagination the free indulgence which it seemed to claim, and then in delightful exuberance it pictured in colors of brilliant harmony the fairest features of the land he loved.

Cloudless sky and sparkling sea,
Cliff and shore and forest tree,
Glen and stream and mountain blue
Burst at once upon the view ;
The gay, the beautiful, the grand
Blending over wave and land
Till the eye can ask no more
Than it hath in sweet Glandore.

There was one other influence that swayed him all through life, viz., his intense devotion to the Holy See. It appears in all his works—in his "Church Tract," in his "Essays," in his "Reviews," but prose could not contain it. He wanted to communicate it, to make it popular, to enshrine it in some work of art, where it could not be forgotten or hidden away. This he did in his little "Song for the Pope," which is still sung and will long be honored at all social reunions of the Irish clergy. In the third stanza of this lyric effusion the old man gave concentrated expression to the two dominant passions of his heart—his love of country and his love of Rome.

"O'er all the orb no land more true
Than our own old Catholic land,
Through ages of blood to the Rock hath stood ;
Truc may she ever stand !
Oh, ne'er may the star St. Patrick set
On her radiant brow decay !
Hurrah for the grand old Catholic land !
For the grand old Pope hurrah !"

We should like to give here a sketch, however short, of many other Maynooth men—of Dr. Kenehan, the great Celtic scholar and the author of a valuable work on the “History of Music,” who was president of the college for many years; of Dr. Montague, one of the ablest administrators who ever ruled the college; of Dr. Joseph Dixon, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, author of a valuable “Introduction to Holy Scripture,” and many others, but we feel that we have run our course and have got fair latitude. There is one feature, however, of the work of the college on which we have laid but little stress, and which we must naturally regard as the main purpose of its existence. We mean the teaching and spiritual training of the students. In that matter we must only allow results to speak. Maynooth, which began a hundred years ago, with fifty students, has now six hundred and twenty students resident in the college. During the greater part of the century it has had over four hundred. The course of studies extends over seven years and in some cases over nine. The great numbers that have passed through this course are chiefly in Ireland, but many of them are scattered over foreign lands, all engaged in the same good work. In Ireland, one of them is a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, two are archbishops, eighteen are bishops. In America they count amongst their number the Archbishops of St. Louis and Chicago; in Australia, the Archbishop of Melbourne; in South Africa, the Bishop of Cape Town, etc. The number of dignitaries and hard-working missionary priests in other grades of the hierarchy cannot easily be reckoned. Thus, Maynooth has not only given the greater number of its priests to the Irish Church during the past century, but like the great institutions of the olden times—Iona, Bangor, Lismore, Clonard—has sent faithful and zealous messengers of the Gospel to every part of the world.

J. F. HOGAN.

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH.

THE GRANDEUR OF ANCIENT ROME—A PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL.

THE history of Rome is almost the only ancient history worth knowing. The great monarchies that preceded Rome—Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea, Persia and Macedon—disappeared like falling stars; their language and remains may instruct the philologist and the antiquarian, as *aërolites* and meteoric stones interest the scientist; but only the spirit and influence of Rome still continue to inform the world. We rank the Greeks with that class of men whom Napoleon contemptuously called *Idéologues*. The Romans, on the contrary, were, above all things, men of action. We have read of Greeklings, but who has discovered a diminutive for Romans? Etymology even points a finger in the right direction, for the more important terms of religion, and words that convey a nobler idea of conduct and of duty, come to us from the Latin and not from the Greek language. Thus we have Divinity, Trinity, Incarnation, Absolution, Consecration, Communion, Ordination, Ceremony and Pontiff; thus, also, we study the *classics*, we live under *civil* government and *republican* institutions, we love *urbanity*, we respect a *statesman*, we admire a *victorious* general. In the history of Greece there was an Ionic Confederacy and an Achæan League, but the Greeks never seemed able to get beyond the idea of a city and rise to empire. They could form States but never a Nation, and there was always something narrow and parochial about the public policy of Athens, Thebes and Sparta. The Romans, on the contrary, felt their spirit constantly swell within them to extend the boundaries and the power of Rome. A faint-hearted sentimentalist has said that a people is happy that has no history, but so did Sancho Panza say "Blessing on him who invented sleep." Americans will scorn the "dreamful ease" of lotus-eaters, and call that people happy which has a stirring, struggling, active and energetic history, a progressive people preparing better things for generations yet unborn.

The poets, historians and philosophers of Rome have lauded, almost beyond measure, their own power and glory; but the Holy Ghost is a witness in their favor in the first Book of Maccabees, viii., 1-16. We must read Roman history with the assured conviction that God made the Romans so great only as a preparation for the empire of Christianity. St. Paul, it is true, tells us that they were "without mercy." They were selfish and cruel, and carried out to the letter in their dealings with other people the

spirit of that old predatory family of the Scottish Borders, "Thou shalt want ere I want."¹ Still, their courage and devotion were sublime, and in reading of the violent deaths of so many of their heroes, we feel a sort of contempt for the spiritless end of Alexander the Great, of whom the Scriptures tell us, "and after all these things, he fell down upon his bed and knew that he should die." When Vespasian saw his end approach, he rose from his couch, although tortured with pain, saying that an emperor should meet death standing: "Imperatorem, ait, stantem mori oportere."

The evolution of original Rome was extraordinary. The Rome of Romulus—Roma Quadrata—originally confined to the Palatine was to cover the Seven Hills; and

"Her speedy growth alarmed the States around,
Jealous; yet soon, by wondrous virtue won,
They sink into her bosom."

Roma means *strength*, and Rome was a name that struck fear into all who heard it; but the anagram is amor—*love*. Rome conquered but to save. It is also singular that a word in such common use as *palace* carries the mind back to the days when Evander, the shepherd-king, dwelt on the Palatine, which Festus² tells us was so called because flocks of sheep pastured and bleated thereon: *Quod palare, id est errare, ibi pecudes solerent*. Now, the legitimate successor of this king and priest and shepherd of his people is the Bishop of Rome, our Holy Father the Pope, under whom and with whom—*urbis et orbis*—there is "but one fold and one shepherd."³

Roman conquests are justified politically and philosophically, because they added to civilization new dominions, and developed in the conquered races a capacity for progress in the higher conditions of life. The world owes to Rome that noble idea of Law as opposed to the debasing conception of Will, and from this all modern advances of society have been developed. When a Roman general had completed the conquest of a country, its government was transferred to a civil officer called prætor, who was a magistrate charged with administering justice. Hence the term *Jus Prætorium* given to the body of his decisions. His authority was unlimited; but unless he ruled with equity, he would be called to an account and punished when he returned to Rome. He did not usually dare to exercise the whims, the humors, the caprice and the tyranny of an individual mind. He represented in his office the collective wisdom of the citizens of Rome, and was responsible in his person for the prudence, justice and moderation

¹ Motto of the Cranstouns, one of whom was Governor of Rhode Island in 1724.

² *De Signif. Verb.*

³ John, x., 16.

with which he had administered his trust. All his edicts and public acts were prefaced by those famous initials, S. P. Q. R., which signified that the Senate and People of Rome were a terror to evil-doers but a guarantee of redress to the innocent. The highest reward the prætor could expect when his term was ended would be to have a medal struck in his honor with his name and the words *provincia pacata* engraved thereon, to show that he had pacified the province, reorganized its government, and brought its administration within the sphere of the public faith and peace of Rome: *Fides publica; Pax romana*. It was no exaggeration of Pliny to speak of the immeasurable grandeur of the peace of Rome: *Immensa romanæ pacis magnitudine*. No wonder the poet Rutilius Numatianus, although of the race of the conquered and romanized Gauls, addressing Rome personified after bathing the Forum with his tears as he takes leave of the Eternal City, cries:

“*Fecisti patriam diversis gentibus unam;
Profuit invitis, te dominante, capi;
Dumque affers victis patrii consortia juris,
Urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat.*”

Of many men one country thou dost make;
Thou savest all, if all to thee shalt take;
And whilst dost share the benefit of Law
One city makest of what was a world before.

Roman civilization differed from older civilizations in some essential points. The Greeks called all older people Barbarians, and the eastern monarchies always kept their conquered subjects in the relation almost of slaves to their masters. The Romans, on the contrary, assimilated conquered races, admitting them gradually to all the rights of Roman citizenship. This was remarked and lauded by Saint Augustine in earlier, and by Sir Francis Bacon in later times. The former says in his “Treatise on the City of God.”¹ “All who belonged to the Roman Empire were, by a most kind and generous policy, admitted to citizenship and placed on an equality with the citizens of Rome itself; so that what was formerly the privilege of a few now became the rights of all.”² The latter in his essay (XXIXth) on the “True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates,” writes: “All states that are liberal of naturalization towards strangers, are fit for Empire. . . . Never any state was in this point, so open to receive strangers into their body, as were the Romans. Therefore it sorted with them

¹ Lib. v., Cap. xvii.

² In the original; *Gratissime atque humanissime factum est, ut omnes ad Romanum imperium pertinentes societatem acciperent civitatis et Romani cives essent; ac si esset omnium, quod erat ante paucorum.*

accordingly; for they grew to the greatest monarchy." If we substitute republic for monarchy, we might justly attribute these words to ourselves; for nothing has so much increased the population, wealth and formidableness of the United States as the good use made by Congress of its power "To establish an uniform rule of naturalization;"¹ and it is also curious, for the sake of analogy, to note that among the grievances against King George III., enumerated in our Declaration of Independence is this one: "He has endeavored to prevent the population of these states; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners (and) refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither."

Another distinguishing characteristic of Roman civilization was respect for law. Other people had law even while living under despots; but law like that of the Medes and Persians² hampers with changed conditions, rather than assists development. Law, in Rome, kept pace with the growth of the city until it expanded, at last, into that great body—*Corpus Juris*—which Bossuet called the grandest product of the human mind and which is the groundwork of legislation for modern Europe and America. The original constitution of the Roman Republic was contained in the Twelve Tables which the school boys for four hundred years had it as an invariable task to commit to memory. It is a simple code founded on nature and reason. Cicero inculcates, as does every Roman jurist before him, that law is a necessary condition of liberty. We are the servants of law, that we may be free: *Servi legum, ut liberi esse possimus*; and no more fitting commentary can be found on the *De Officiis*, the *De Legibus*, and the *De Republica* than these inspired words, "An obedient man shall speak of victory."³ In the Roman Republic as in the American, the civil law was supreme. No general could assume command of troops until the *Imperium* had been conferred upon him by the Senate acting on a *Lex curiata*, or, as we would now say, until he had received his commission. The civilian character of the Romans was so well recognized that Virgil even after the passing of the republic and the rise of absolutism, sings of the "Romans masters of all, the men who wear the Toga," which was the distinctive garment of the citizen as opposed to the *Paludamentum* or soldier's cloak. He has seemed to want to insist on the fact that Rome rose to so great a domination less by the power of the sword than by the influence of her laws.

The Roman youth was taught that man's first duty was to the immortal Gods, the next to his country, then to his parents, and

¹ Constitution, Article I., Section 8.

² Daniel vi.

³ Prov. xxi, 28.

thus on to other people; *ut prima officia diis immortalibus, secunda patræ, tertia parentibus, deinceps gradatim reliquis debeantur.*¹

When people live under law they will prosper and acquire property and build up institutions of beneficence and learning. The Romans had a profound respect for the rights of property, and it is wonderful how much of the Institutes, the Codex and the Digests treat of real and personal property. These rights guaranteed to the citizen by law were a great advance upon other civilizations where everything, in theory at least, belonged to the ruler. One of the laws of the Twelve Tables consists of only four words, but they teach the sacredness of property, the importance of vested interests and the value of citizenship; *adversus hostem æterna auctoritas*; "against a stranger the right of possession is eternal,"—i.e., a stranger, a foreigner, an enemy cannot, even by prescription, ever obtain legal sanction in the property of a Roman.

The superiority of ancient Rome to all previous civilizations is also manifest in its engineering and architectural skill, which covered the world with works of public utility. Others raised hanging gardens, temples, obelisks and endless colonnades; but they made roads, bridges, sewers, built aqueducts and erected amphitheatres. It is worth remarking, as an illustration of the practical genius of the Romans, that the two oldest and best preserved of all their monuments are the *Cloaca Maxima* and the *Mamertinum*, a sewer and a prison, which testify to the existence of law and of sanitary regulations. In Asia Minor, where the Turks have been dominant for five hundred years, almost the only roads and bridges still in use were constructed by the Romans two thousand years ago. This shows the difference between a Roman and a Mohammedan conquest.

The greatness of a people can always be measured by the position of woman among them. In nothing so much as in this does the superiority of Roman to every other civilization stand out. Professor Mahaffy, in his "Social Life in Greece," p. 147, says of the Greeks of the Attic age, that he finds it hard "to explain the really Asiatic jealousy with which women of the higher classes were locked up in imperial Athens and the contempt with which they were systematically treated," and Macaulay is not ashamed to avow it part of an excellent education, in his essay on the Athenian orators, to finish the day in the company of a courtesan: "and away to sup with Aspasia." Nothing like this could be said of the Romans. The status of woman was recognized by law. She had her rights as well as her duties. The impure customs of Eastern nations, the cruel observances of Phœnician cities, the unnatural unions of the Egyptians, the obscene

¹ Cic. de officiis, i., 55.

shrines of the Greeks excited among the Romans only horror and disgust. They could not have made a hero of Sardanapalus or have erected temples to a Cyprian or a Corinthian Venus.

They built temples to female chastity—*Pudicitia*—and to the happiness of woman—*Fortuna Muliebris*. Among other people, woman was a slave or a toy of man, but among the Romans she was his wife and his companion. Who can read the short but touching chapter of the "Annals" (iii., 76), in which Tacitus describes the funeral of Junia, niece of Cato, sister of Brutus, wife of Cassius, dying under the despotism of Tiberius, sixty-four years after the battle of Philippi, without recognizing the fact that even in pagan Rome woman had a sphere of usefulness and action beginning in the family and continued in public life? The honor and inviolability of vows of chastity among the Romans is evidenced by the institution of the Vestal Virgins. The Holy Scripture,¹ Herodotus and other ancient writers prove that it was among the devilish deceptions of Gentilism to induce females to sacrifice their chastity on the altars of their Gods. So great an infamy never existed among the Romans, who exalted the female sex in the honor they rendered to virginity, and the divine beatitude of the clean of heart rested upon these vestals in later times when so many of them became Christians, and we hear Prudentius in his hymn to Saint Lawrence say,

Ædemque Laurenti tuam Vestalis intrat Claudia.

Lovers of the classics will remember the exquisite tribute to holy purity which the pagan poet, Catullus, pays in the *Carmen Nuptiale* (lxii.), where the virgins beginning sing, *Ut flos in septis secretus nascitur hortis*, than which there is nothing more beautiful in any language, except the lines in Milton's *Comus* on "Saintly Chastity." Too little attention, as we have frequently observed, is paid by visitors to the *Museo Chiaramonti* in the Vatican to what is yet a singular monument which illustrates passages from Pliny² and Valerius Maximus,³ and makes us believe that it might well be that a merciful God who chose a Virgin for his mother when he became Man to redeem the world would work a miracle even among pagans for the sake of so great a virtue as "the sun-clad power of Chastity." This is an ancient, beautiful and life-size marble statue of Tuccia with a sieve in her hands and in the act of walking. She was a vestal virgin wrongfully accused of having violated her vow. It was in the year 609 A.U.C.,⁴ and the maiden, protesting her innocence, proposed to

¹ Baruch., vi., 42-43.

² *H. Nat.*, xxviii., 33.

³ *Factorum Dictorumque Memorabilium*, viii., i., 5.

⁴ *Ab Urbe Condita*: From the foundation of the city, from which the Roman^s computed time.

prove it by carrying a sieve full of water from the Tiber to the Temple of Vesta, near the Forum, which she did. The death of Lucretia, too, on which Saint Augustine is so severe,¹ yet bears testimony to the high ideal that the Romans had of conjugal chastity and how they execrated and avenged the abominations of the younger Tarquin :

“ Since Rome herself in them doth stand disgraced,”

as Brutus exclaims in Shakespeare's noble poem. The Romans gave binding force to the original divine ordinance of monogamy or the life-long union of one man and one woman. A recent writer, Mr. Charles Letourneau, says in his otherwise reprehensible work on the “ Evolution of Marriage and of the Family,” “ Roman customs conceded to woman a certain liberty of manners which the Greeks would not have tolerated. The Roman woman walked in the streets, went to the theatre with the men, shared in banquets, etc., yet she was, especially in primitive Rome, subjected first to her father, then to her husband, and, besides, public opinion obliged the woman to use in great moderation the practical liberty that was left to her. The famous epitaph of the Roman matron, *domum mansit, lanam fecit*, is well known. This epitaph may perhaps exaggerate, but it does not lie. Suetonius tells us that the daughters and grand-daughters of Augustus were compelled to weave and spin and that the emperor usually wore no other garments but those made by the hands of his wife and sisters ” (p. 199). One of the beautiful stories of ancient Rome, which the artist Camuccini had made popular, is that of the ostentatious Lady of Capua who after spreading on the table her rings and bracelets, her precious stones and starry gems, asks to see Cornelia's jewels, and is told, as her two boys come in from school, that *these* are her jewels. It was an answer worthy of the mother of the Gracchi, who refused the hand of King Ptolemy, esteeming it more honorable to remain the widow of a Roman citizen than to become the wife of a sovereign prince. It was, indeed, a great thing to bear the proud title of Roman Matron.

Another special distinction of the Romans was their patriotism. Their native country was endeared to them as *Patria*, the Fatherland. Thus the national poet sang of Brutus who put aside the affection of a parent to remember only his duty to the state :

Vincet amor patriæ laudemque immensa cupido.

This love of country bred among them a practical common sense which saved them from the fate of Greeks and Orientals, for “ tide whatever betide ” to them personally, there was always something

¹ *De Civ. Dei*, i., 19.

above them, something greater than they and dearer to them than life—the Commonwealth—*Respublica*. This sentiment produced a wonderful courage and a species of exultant certitude in the final triumph of the Eternal City, no matter what the present emergency and no matter how imminent and great the present danger. Witness the answer sent to the victorious king of Epirus offering terms of peace, “Rome will not negotiate with an enemy on her soil.” Witness the senate and people of Rome going out to meet Terentius Varro after the tremendous slaugh’er of Cannæ and thanking him because he had not despaired of the republic: *Quod de republica non desperasset*, says Livy.¹ A defeated Carthaginian general would have been nailed to a cross like the dead lions of Numidia which the Mercenaries always crucified. Livy has also preserved² an account of the haughty but courageous conduct of Popilius Laenas sent as ambassador to Antiochus, king of Syria, then marching on Egypt an allied state of Rome. Antiochus, on meeting the Roman, offered him his hand, which was indignantly refused, and Popilius gave him the letter of the senate ordering an immediate cessation of hostilities. Antiochus read the letter and promised to reply after consulting his captains. Then Popilius drew with his ivory staff a circle in the sand around the king, and commanded him not to stir out of it until he had given a decided answer. This audacity so disconcerted Antiochus that he at once yielded: *Faciam, inquit, quod censet Senatus*. There is nothing like this in all history, except, perhaps, the composure of Warren Hastings, Governor-General of Bengal, alone in the heart of India and blockaded by the insurgents of Benares, spurning the apology and liberal offers of the Rajah. The history of ancient Rome becomes still more fascinating when it throws a search light, as it were, upon the history of our own times. It is now over thirty years ago that the news of the first great battle for the Union and of our ignominious defeat was talked of at Rome. “All is over,” they said; but a young American student of divinity told them not to be so sure of that, for with an enemy before Washington, Congress had just voted five hundred thousand men and five hundred million dollars to prosecute the war. The company laughed in derision; all but a certain old cardinal who said, “The Federals are like the Romans after Cannæ; they do not despair of the Republic; they will win.” And we won.

The supernatural is raised upon the natural foundation. Good seed grows up when it falls on good ground. Now, the Romans were originally a monogamous, law-abiding and religious people. They were monotheistic and acquainted with the primitive tradi-

¹ Bk. xxii.

² Bk. lxx.

tions of the human race, and, to some extent, with the lives, hopes and expectations of the Hebrew patriarchs. The Jewish people had, we know, a providential mission. It was set up like a beacon-fire in the midst of idolatrous nations to give light to all the world. The great monarchies of ancient times were brought successively into contact and relation with this singular people. There is a noteworthy passage in Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple (circa 1005 B. C.) which illustrates this point.¹ There is reason to believe that among the strangers from far-off lands who visited Jerusalem and prayed in the temple, and received instruction from the Levites, was Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome. We have the testimony of St. Paul and some early Fathers to the primitive monotheism and purer religion of the Romans. It is not pretended that the Apostle's words in Rom. i., 18-25 apply exclusively to Rome, but, writing to the Christians of the Imperial City, we may suppose that he had her history and her circumstances more especially in view. We are not, indeed, told by the Apostle how Rome obtained this knowledge, which was afterwards so generally cast aside for grosser things, but others have striven to elucidate the matter.²

Tertullian, who had a perfect knowledge of Roman history and jurisprudence, says, in his apology for the Christians, addressed to the Emperor Septimius Severus, and which was composed at Rome between the years 197 and 202: "Observe that whatever is good in your own laws has been taken from the Divine Code, which is more ancient, as I have proved when speaking of Moses."³

Juvenal, the great satirist of the first century, writing contemptuously of converts to Judaism, who were then numerous, mentions this mysterious Code.⁴ Clement of Alexandria wrote in the third century: "Numa, king of the Romans, was a Pythagorean, and, assisted by the doctrines derived from Moses, he prohibited the Romans from making an image of God in the likeness of either a man or a beast. The Romans, for the first hundred and seventy years, during which they built temples, did not make a single sculptured or painted image; for Numa had instructed them, after the manner of an esoteric (or secret) doctrine, in the truth that it is impossible to attain to the worship of the Most High except through the mind (spirit)."⁵ The testimony of Clement is confirmed by that of the pagan writers Plutarch and Varro. The

¹ III. Kings, viii., 41-43.

² *Monotheism—the Primitive Religion of Rome*, by Rev Henry Formby, London, 1877; *Des Causes de la Grandeur de Rome Païenne, Par un Prêlat Romain*, Paris, 1880; *Documents Historiques sur la religion des Romains et sur la connaissance qu'ils ont pu avoir des Traditions bibliques par leur rapport avec les Juifs*, A. Bonetty, 4 vols., of which the first was published in 1867.

³ Ap. xlv.

⁴ *Sat.* xiv., 100-102.

⁵ *Strom.* i., xv.

ancient Romans recognized very jealously the holiness of altars and temples. They were in strong contrast to the flippant Greeks, and Denis of Halicarnassus says, in the second book of the *Antiquities*, "I much prefer the theology of the Romans, considering how very few of the religious traditions of the Greeks are of a kind to lead to any good." The Romans never warred against the religion of their enemies, but tried to conciliate and to win over their gods. Hence, in besieging cities, the Roman priests performed a special act called *Evocatio Deorum*.¹ To the Romans the violation of sacred things was less an offence against the state than an insult to the Divinity. In contrast with this, we may recall the awful retribution which was inflicted one hundred and fifty years after the event, by Alexander the Great, on the sacerdotal community of the Branchidæ, which his army came upon, near the site of the later city of Samarcand, while marching to India. It was, indeed, a dramatic situation, this sudden and unexpected meeting of Greeks in Central Asia. The ancestors of their community had been guardians and treasurers of a temple of Apollo on the Ionian coast, and had surrendered everything to Xerxes as he was advancing into Europe. In the eyes of the Macedonian troops they were guilty of an odious *treason against their native country*, and for this, and not for any violation of duty to their God, their descendants were exterminated. The Romans had the highest respect for the sanctity of an oath. Saint Augustine commends them greatly for it.² Hence the constant opposition between the *Fides Publica* of the Romans and the *Fides Punica* of the Carthaginians. We have a great example of the good faith of the Romans in Regulus returning voluntarily to Africa and to certain death:

"*Interque moerentes amicos
Egregius properaret exul.*"—HORACE.

"And forth the noble exile strode
Whilst friends in anguish lined the road."

The history of pagan Rome is but a preparation for that of Christian Rome. The two Romes must be studied together and in their relation to one another, that we "may declare the virtues of Him who hath called us from darkness to His admirable light." (I. Pet., ii., 9.) Livy and Tacitus should be followed by St. Augustine and St. Gregory the Great; Virgil by Dante. Rome and

¹ Coulanges, *La Cité Antique*, Ch. xv. Boissier, *La Religion Romaine*, Paris, 1878, 2 vols., and *Fin du Paganisme*, Paris, 1894, 2 vols., are exhaustive works on the subject of the Religion of the Romans, but only from the time of Augustus.

² *De civ. Dei*, i., 24.

the Campagna must be visited with Horace in one pocket and the Acts of the Apostles in the other.

A republican form of government is the only one worthy of a free, enlightened and prosperous people. It was during the Republic that Rome attained the summit of her glory. The Empire precipitated her decline and fall. Then the courtiers and chief officers of state, or of the palace, were freedmen and libertines—ignoble wretches who addressed their master as *Divus*, and spoke of the divinity of the empire. Then was admitted that maxim of aulic jurisprudence—the most shameful, the most infamous and the most degrading to mankind: the Will of the Prince has force of Law; *Quod placuit principi id legis vigorem habet*. There then was an end to the reign of Legality and Order, and *Pax Romana* was but a vain expression. Pagan Rome with all her grandeur only shows how inadequate is human nature without Christianity to realize, to their full extent, the True, the Good and the Beautiful. Pagan Rome could not possibly satisfy, any more than modern and more refined paganism can satisfy, the yearnings of the human mind for some certain knowledge as to the unseen world beyond us, and the cry of the human heart for an Object to be loved by and to love with a love “strong as death,” in this life of the world around us and within us.

The Stoics, noblest and last of the Romans, became pessimists, and ended by raising suicide to a fine art. Hopeless pride and the desolation of despair characterize the end of the republic and the course of empire. To the Christian there is nothing more horrifying in the Latin classics than that splendid but terrible blasphemy which Lucan puts in the mouth of Cato who kills himself that he may not see the face of Cæsar:

“*Victrix causa Deis placuit—Sed victa Catoni.*”—*Phars* i., 168.

‘Cato loves the lost cause; nor cares what the Gods have favored.’

Then again that British chief whom Tacitus describes driven by the Roman legions to the end of the earth, and standing on a cliff above the waters of the ocean, who turns before he takes the fatal leap to utter this reproach:

“*Ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.*”—*Agric.*, xxx.

‘They make a desert and they call it peace.’

Yes, Rome said: Be mine and I will give you peace and ye shall share with me “all the kingdoms of the world, and their glory.” Men answered, But thy peace leaves us still unsatisfied. Thy peace indeed! “A thing wherein we feel there is some hidden want.”

Then from a distant country, little, poor, and despised, was heard the voice of Him who said: "Come to me all you that labor and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you. Take up My yoke upon you, and learn of Me because I am meek and humble of heart; and you shall find rest to your souls."¹ Oh joy! Jesus of Nazareth passes by. Rome is penitent and proud no more. She sees on the eastern horizon the dawn of Pax Christiana.

ROBERT SETON, D.D.

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL EXHIBIT AT THE COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.

THE Columbian Exposition was a series of surprises. Not the least among them was the Catholic exhibition of education. This was specially surprising to those who, having in mind only the subtle processes of mental action, declare that education cannot be exhibited. They forget that behind all that is manifest of man to the eye there is a spirit; that, corresponding to all that is external and visible, there is the internal and unseen, which cannot be exhibited apart from its natural manifestations. In a sense, the real man is never seen by mortal eye; and yet, we are always discoursing about seeing men. The power of speech itself, by which the spirit declares its sentiments in words, depends very much upon what is unsaid, but suggested. The value of all exhibitions turns upon the power of the sense of sight—that "most perfect of all our senses," to which they appeal. For centuries, fairs used this sense in aid of trade. Articles were brought together in greater or less numbers or variety for inspection, sale, or purchase; but, in recent years, their service in the way of instruction has been recognized. Thus, great exhibitions now, not only mark epochs, but give incalculable impulse to progress. It has been said, that the great exhibition in London, in 1851, in which instruction was first made so prominent, was inspired by Prince Albert to help tide Great Britain over threatened industrial revolution. In this higher function, this use of educative power, education itself has become an object of exhibitions, not its subtle processes to be sure, any more than the unseen and inde-

¹ Matt. xi.

scribable processes of inventing the telephone, are set forth when that instrument is presented to the eye. If we reflect a moment, we notice that every time we compare teachers, schools, or their methods, or principles, in choosing for ourselves or our children, we are taking into account what can be seen, estimated, or measured. On this basis rests the setting forth of all educational claims. We can see and compare grounds, buildings, text-books, desks, laboratories, the thousand and one school appliances; the work of pupils which can be preserved in writing or drawing, and their work in wood, metals, textiles, clay, or stone, or the varied facts represented by statistics, or the manifold conditions which the camera can reproduce and preserve for examination. Indeed, in the Chicago exhibition we learned that the stenographer could report for us every word uttered by pupil or teacher, and describe every incident of the school-day's experience; and that the phonograph could report for us, in their very tones, the questions and answers, and the lessons in reading and music.

The Catholic exhibit of education was, moreover, a surprise for those who believe that the Catholic Church seeks its ends by concealed means. Here there was no concealment. Here, for the examination of every one who came, was the work of students in every subject taught, from those in the kindergarten to the most abstruse and profound in the professions—in the common branches, in history, local and general, ancient and modern, political and ecclesiastical; in church doctrines and sacraments; in the obligations of patriotism, and the sacredness of the oath. Here was the work; sometimes, in a most unchanged condition, just as it came from the hand of the pupil; and again, with the correction of the teacher added, showing both the work of the pupil and the method of the teacher; again, artistic illuminations were added, with pen and pencil. The work in wood was for the most common use, or for the sacred purposes of the altar; again, there are specimens of needlework, for the most common uses, or delicate laces and rich embroideries, or sacred vestments for priests or bishops; or, in crayon or oil, are the portraits of those eminent in the Church. At hand, were the schedules of schools in which the time occupied in each subject was given. The whole was an appeal to the American boasted fairness. It was saying to all the world, "Here is what we do; judge ye!"

Moreover, it was on the same floor, and in close proximity to the great public-school exhibitions; thus affording an excellent opportunity for comparison, which the friends of each should make without injustice to either. Few of the most devout Catholic visitors failed to find something unexpected as they studiously and reverently wandered through its alcoves and sought to gather

its lessons. They did not know that their own schools were so numerous, or comprehend the vastness of their work. Not only the great cities, and remote corners of the United States, but Hawaii, Mauritius, France, and other distant lands were represented. That the vastness of the collection faithfully represented the work done in the schools participating, could not be doubted by any one who, like the writer, had visited not a few of them, and reported many of them annually for half a generation.

Clearly, the exhibit is phenomenal; there has been none of church education like it. No one, who would estimate aright the educational force of the times, can ignore its significance. Its objects, manifestly, are manifold; but pre-eminently, it is an appeal to the judgment of mankind. There is no civil authority of city, state, or nation behind it; yet one idea pervades it, one authority has called it together and rules throughout the work it represents. This idea, this authority, has established the schools from which this material was collected, over against public schools and other private schools, and comes for an inspection of results.

Says the eminent Bishop Spalding in an able article, urging participation, "We shall thus place before the eyes of the millions who will visit the Exposition a clear demonstration of the great work the Church in the United States is doing to develop a civilization which is in great part the outgrowth of religious principles, and which depends for its continued existence upon the morality which religious faith alone can make strong and enduring. There can be little doubt that many are opposed to the Catholic system from the fact that they have never given serious attention to the principles upon which it rests or to the ends which it aims to reach. It is the fashion to praise education, and hence all declare themselves favorable to it; but those who have it enough at heart to make it a matter of thoughtful and persevering meditation, are like the lovers of truth, but few. But those who do not read seriously or think deeply may be got to open their eyes and look, and what they see may arouse interest and lead to investigation. Opinion rules the world, and the Catholic exhibit offers a means to help mould opinion on the subject of education, which is, in importance, second to no other; and in an age in which the tendency is to take schools from under the control of the Church and to put them under the control of the State in such a way as to weaken their religious character, nothing which may assist in directing opinion to true views upon this subject may be neglected by those who believe that education is essentially religious."

Here is a frank, direct statement for all, whether agreeing with it or not, and may well awaken thought and turn attention to the exhibit.

This is a period of facts, hard facts, if you please; and the exhibit, as a great fact, was intended to arrest attention and turn it to these schools and their methods. No statement, no statistics, no discussion ever conveyed such an idea of Catholic education as was here disclosed. It was a great object-lesson—not, indeed, education itself, but so near to it as to require no added description; but if that were desired, the catalogue could be procured of the indefatigable manager, or one of his assistants was at hand to answer questions.

The thoughts revealed by the exhibit in its many forms to the millions who saw it, are now on their travels through the civilized lands of the world, and will continue travelling while the memory of the collection remains in human minds. No one can compute its propagating power. It cannot, will not, everywhere produce the same impression. Some may be impelled only to find fault with it, to assail its object, to dwell on its deficiencies; but that is not attempted in this writing. Here it is sought to promote its influence in the direction of progress.

Improvement in education has in it a sign of betterment for mankind, which may hope to find a measure of favorable response even in those minds which are not attuned to the highest notes in the scale of service for our race.

Look more closely into the great collection.

Here are 29,214 square feet of floor-space so divided into 114 compartments or alcoves, and provided with shelving as to furnish 60,000 square feet of wall-surface and desk-room for the installation of an uncounted number of articles illustrating educational progress and conditions. One who undertook to record the enumeration of articles from 68 schools of the Christian Brothers found 5086 copy-books, 79 volumes of class work, 1008 separate sheets of drawings, 419 drawing books, 148 volumes of students' drawings and thirty large maps, together with 42 specimens of wood-work, 79 in iron, 14 in map engraving, 17 musical instruments, 24 in printing and binding, and 20 annals of agronomical stations, and so forth. Shall I enumerate the subjects taught in this group alone? In one of these schools, pupils are offered training in nineteen different trades. Schools for boys exhibit fifteen arts and twenty-six distinct and separate industries. In the schools under the direction of the Roman Catholic Church, in the United States alone, there may be said to be enrolled 800,000; a single society, the Sisters of Notre Dame, Milwaukee, showed by a great rising structure of bricks pictured on the wall, an attendance of 73,703.

The inscriptions of arch-diocese and diocese over the alcoves pointed at once to the subdivision of material in its installation, and illustrated the ecclesiastical loyalty of the teaching bodies. Twenty

dioceses were represented, seventeen teaching orders and a considerable number of separate institutions or schools, such as the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., the Papal College Josephinum, Columbus, Ohio; Miss M. L. Ash's Art School, Nashville, Tenn.; Catholic text-books, the Columbian Library of Catholic Authors, and the League of the Sacred Heart.

The three diocesan exhibits which most impressed visitors were those of Chicago, San Francisco and New York. The central attraction of the first was the statue of the archbishop in Carrara marble bearing the inscription, "Protector of our Schools." The statistical tables with the New York exhibit tell us that its schools possess \$4,000,000 of property and that their annual cost is \$260,000 and that there are within the diocese one hundred and sixty-eight parochial schools. The Fort Wayne diocese adds to the interest of its parochial schools exhibited by giving something of their history.

The general public never before had such an opportunity to gain so distinct an idea of the educational work of the several Catholic orders. Here one may study how each conducts instruction in its own sphere and all work in harmony and under one supreme authority. The influence of the exhibit upon the pedagogical principles and methods of the teachers of these schools, so evidently constantly in the minds of its chief promoters, was of incalculable importance.

Bishop Spalding, with effective urgency, declared: "The exhibit will help also to enlighten and stimulate teachers by diffusing among them a more real and practical knowledge of the various educational methods and appliances. It will arouse new interest in pedagogics as a science and an art. We may easily become the victim of the fallacy that a Catholic school is Catholic because this adjective is affixed to its name, or because in it prayers are said and catechism is taught. A poor school cannot exert a wholesome influence of any kind. Idle, inattentive, listless and unpractical children will not become religious however much they are made to pray and recite catechism. In a truly religious character self-respect, truthfulness, a love of thoroughness and excellence, a disinterested ambition are as important as a devotional spirit. When the natural virtues are lacking the supernatural have no proper soil in which to grow. A right school system does not of necessity make a good school. The aim is to advance the cause of Catholic education. We care little where or by whom the work is done."

No one would expect the work to be of uniform merit. Here was the inferior over against the superior. A brief statement like

this cannot go into detailed specifications of excellence. Volumes would be required. A large number of expert judges were occupied months with this task. The studious found ample opportunity for the application of that great educational principle, study by comparison. Did any one wish to look into the entire system of Catholic education in the United States or any part of it, and judge of its philosophical fitness? The material was at hand. Is any one agitating any of the numerous educational questions of the day? Here he might find valuable data to aid in the settlement. Are kindergarten methods sound and in themselves desirable? Do they give the pupil the advantage in the school years which follow or in the active pursuits of life? How far, if at all, may these principles be followed with older pupils? From various quarters there are kindergarten collections, but specially excellent from San Francisco.

In the comparison of schools does the early introduction of nature studies show any advantage? In these studies how far shall the pupil depend upon the object, picture or description? How early may the doctrines of the Church be taught? Are morals best taught by precept or example, or by both? What forms of punishment are best? At what age should the respective studies be begun? In penmanship shall the letters be sloping after the German or more upright after the English? Shall the first lessons in language be given by the abstract a-b-c method or by the use of words or sentences and in connection with pictures or objects? How far shall the advanced teaching of language be occupied in learning the rules of grammar or how far in memorizing choice selections or the construction of phrases and sentences or writing of compositions? Shall the earliest lessons in numbers or arithmetic be abstract or *memoriter* or by the use of objects? Do results show that there is any advantage in adapting the subject or method to the age or to the order of mental development? Do the schools in which church doctrine or church history is emphasized show corresponding advantage in conduct or in attention to other studies? Do the schools in which the teachers have a clear and well-defined conception of pedagogical principles and methods show corresponding superior results? Here, too, is room for indefinite comparison of sanitary conditions of grounds and buildings, of ventilation, heating and lighting, of long and short sessions for different ages, of postures, sitting and standing, of cultivating the reflective or expressive faculties or other powers in harmony or out of proportion.

What place shall be assigned geography, history, the natural sciences, and what is the best method of teaching each? What appliances and aids may be secured? In advanced courses of

study what should be the relation of natural sciences and the humanities? What shall be the place of modern languages and the method of studying them? How early may logic and metaphysics be introduced and by what methods best taught? How far may the principles of mechanics be used in connection with manual training? In the choice of studies, shall the principle of equivalents be regarded? How far should the selection of a subject depend upon its relation to other subjects in a definite course of study, and how far upon the purposes and aims of the pupils? Under what conditions is there the greater or less educational waste? How far can the teacher be responsible for physical conditions or culture? How shall the teacher know that the pupil's embarrassment in the class, or failure, is due to astigmatism or imperfections in hearing or other physical cause? How may gymnastics be used to advantage? In any scheme of education should manual training of boys and girls be omitted? If it is admitted, what relation should it hold to the other work? Should it aim to instruct in specific trades or in those principles or practices common to several or more trades? How far shall the training depend upon theory and how far upon practice? How far upon their combination? What is the educational advantage of sloyd? To what extent may girls be trained in domestic economy, in cooking, the making of garments, and in the art of nursing? Under what circumstances, at what time, and to what extent may the pupil give attention to the harp, piano, or singing, or fancy work as a mere accomplishment? How far can the general or specific results of school training be improved by careful adjustment of the relations of elementary, secondary, superior, and professional instruction to each other or to a general plan comprehensive of the whole? Do the several religious orders interchange comparisons of principles and methods to the greatest advantage? Do teachers visit each other's schools as much as they might to gain the greatest mutual benefit? How may schools of less merit be brought up to the standard of those of the highest? It is not to be expected that all or any of these questions will be settled beyond revision. The object is not so much final settlement as constant improvement—stimulating all everywhere and at all times to better effort. With note-book in hand, studious and conscientious educators or teachers might be seen at all times putting down their observations upon these or some of the manifold questions which occupy and perplex those interested in the management or instruction of schools. Were they skilled and at the front of their profession, they saw much to confirm them in their high endeavors. Did their work or method when thus brought into comparison appear inferior, what motives did they not find to incite them to gain the power of doing better

as they return to their labors? It should be remembered that the members of teaching orders are under strict professional rules; that they are separated from kindred and from common pursuits, and devote their lives to teaching without the usual expectation of pecuniary reward. With them there is no change of vocation. They have the advantage of a life-service to incite them to excel. The rules and systems of advancement in each order are intended to promote efficiency, on the principle that progress can only be assured in any vocation by the mastery of its profoundest or essential principles. The deeper the well, the surer the sight of stars. Here the advantage of studying diverse schools and methods is greatly enhanced by compact organization of the material and by the fact that it remains at hand unchanged for a minute and prolonged comparison. No doubt, many a member of the teaching orders gained broader and more profound views of the work and objects of his own order than it had been previously possible to attain. Bishop Spalding said, with emphasis: "It is not rash to hope that the Catholic educational exhibit will awaken new zeal, arouse a more generous spirit of sacrifice, inspire a deeper enthusiasm in the cause of Christian education, which is the cause of our country and of our religion."

Who could spend an hour in these alcoves without fixing memories to influence all his future thinking? Even children, however limited or hazy their ideas in the midst of this seemingly endless variation of school products, could not fail to gain impressions of the vast possibilities of education to follow them through life. Their daily tasks at school will have new significance. The impulse to be gained to school training in this way is not to be ignored. It may not be easy to put it down in figures, but it is none the less actual, positive, and abiding. Much will be done to extend its effect by the numerous newspaper notices and criticisms, whether favorable or unfavorable, American or foreign.

The many ways by which, through pen and pencil or needle or otherwise, the person, face, name, act or word of those eminent as officers in the Catholic Church or within its fold was presented told how surely the entire body of instructors of the schools of all grades and of every variety, acknowledge themselves in the bosom of their church. If this manifestation shall seem trivial to the casual observer, it has the significance of reality. The trivial in one view, may in another have solid import.

So of some of the fancy work, such as the harp made of shavings and the pictures in moss and pebbles. They show at least both ingenuity and application and point to the variety of instruction possible. To some, only the teaching of the three "R's" is admissible in any elementary school; any departure is worse than

trivial. For them, the teaching of any skill with the hands, either by theory or practice save that of penmanship, has no place in the school room. They condemn, unheard all, of this indication, of the industries of the farm and shop and business forms taught boys, and all the manifold use of the needle in making or mending garments or in embroidery and the making of lace or the training in household arts or economy, taught girls, to say nothing of the fancy work and accomplishments which they abhor. In this narrow view of school work, typewriting, stenography, and all other arts through which so many find means of self-support, would be excluded; but intelligent and broad minded parents and teachers will not surrender an advantage so important to their children as bread winners. They will go forward seeking only to do more wisely and effectively what they have undertaken. A critical but judicious examination will find in this vast collection of hand work, many suggestive lessons. There may be crude carving, but over against it is the carved high altar from the Josephinum College, Columbus, Ohio. There may be crude work in brass, but there is the set of musical instruments made by pupils. There may be imperfect work in lace, or embroidery, but there are, over against it, specimens of high order, including those in silver and gold and set with gems from schools too numerous to mention. From the simplest industries, such as making brooms, and brushes, we may find illustrations such as plumbing, scroll and machine work, typesetting, printing, binding, and electrotyping. But if any are not satisfied with fancy work, or that in art of industry which shows improvement, they can find an abundance in the common or higher branches of education to occupy any spare time. They may begin with the simplest written work and find at each step upward, through all grades, enough to weary their hands with handling and their eyes with seeing. Let them remember at every step that what they should expect is not perfection, but the signs of striving towards it. The teacher does a great duty who inspires his pupils to unending advancement. Let every grade or form of instruction do this, and its work is not in vain. The mistake should not be made of classifying any of this work out of its place. The compositions of children acquiring the elements of a language, should not be judged by the standards of distinguished scholars, nor their struggles in elementary drawing or painting, by the canons of high art; nor the rude lines of a beginner in the parochial school be condemned because inferior to the elaborate drawings of a bridge complete in all its parts, for the use of the builder, as that exhibited by the La Salle Institute, of New York. The significance of many articles of this class is that they show that opportunities are afforded and that there are struggles to improve them. These

wide and varied opportunities, these many attempts, do not mean that every one is to be an artist, any more than the universal ability to read and write implies that every one is to be great as an orator or writer. No one can rise in either sphere without these elementary steps, and the more general their dissemination, the greater the chances for reaching those who are to be inspired to eminence. In this just view we may find many efforts of merit, and are made sure that where these opportunities are furnished, however elementary, there true science and true art have larger chance for appreciation and beneficent influence.

It would be interesting to trace the effect of the exhibit upon the several organizations of priests and the several orders of brothers and sisters here represented. At no point could these results be more manifest than in the training institutes, colleges, homes or mother-houses so to speak, of each organization. These communities are training schools for the new members of their respective orders. The formation of a religious life, the sundering of family ties, the acquisition of habits of thinking and acting in accordance with the objects and rules of the order, constitute necessarily no unimportant part of the preparation. In these orders for men and women in which teaching is an object, there is, as a rule, specific attention to the history of education, its principles and methods, the theory and practice of teaching. There journals of education may be found at hand, and books on pedagogy. The exhibit shows not only what is done at these centres, but will return a powerful impulse to improvement. What discussions and comparisons will then follow. It has also furnished an excellent opportunity to recall to this generation the triumphs in education of some of these orders in their early years. The educational reforms introduced by the Jesuit Fathers cannot be forgotten. More historic monographs would have been helpful. Naturally, the Brothers of the Christian Schools emphasize their remembrance of their great founder, Jean Baptiste De La Salle, by presenting recent issues of his works relating to the organization and management of schools. In one of these it is stated that he "was born in Rheims, France, April 30, 1651, and died at Saint Yon, April 7, 1719. He was the originator of: 1. The present work; 2. The mutual simultaneous method, 1682, although ascribed to Lancaster, Pestalozzi and Jacotot; 3. Primary schools, properly so-called; 4. Normal school, Rheims, 1684; 5. Technical schools and schools of design, Paris, 1699; Saint Yon, 1705; 6. Boarding schools and academies, Paris, 1698; Saint Yon, 1705; 7. Reformatory schools, Saint Yon, 1705; 8. Sunday schools, Paris, 1699; 9. The popular methods of teaching, catechetical, Socratic and practical. Object-lessons have also been anticipated by him, though to Froebel is accredited the

honor." Here may be studied the theories and the instructions of the great founder of this order touching the organization and conduct of schools with additions derived from the experience of nearly two centuries.

Of those American orders sharing in the exhibit, these brothers point to special preparation for teaching in California, in the Normal Institute at Martinez; in Maryland, at the Normal Institute at Ammendale; in Missouri, La Salle Institute, Glencoe; in New York, at St. Joseph's College, Amawalk. The Jesuit Fathers point to similar opportunities at Santa Clara College, San Francisco, Cal.; the Sisters of Charity to St. Joseph's Academy, Emmetsburg, Md.; the Sisters of Providence to St. Mary's Institute, St. Mary's, Vigo County, Ind.; the Ursuline Nuns to the convent, St. Louis, Mo.; the Visitation Nuns to their convents, Georgetown, D. C., and Brooklyn, N. Y. These will answer as illustrations, but space will not permit even an enumeration of all the houses and institutions where this special preparation is furnished, much less can the colleges and theological seminaries and other schools for higher training be named. It is doubtful whether the members of the teaching orders ever had previously any such opportunity of understanding the work of so many others or of gaining such aid from a study of evidence of their methods in their results. It goes without the saying that those that have done most for the exhibition are likely to be most interested in its study and to derive the greatest benefit from it. In different portions of the collection are evidences of the consideration given to the care of orphans or other unfortunate children. Lecouteulx, St. Mary's Deaf Mute School, at Buffalo, N. Y., under the Sisters of St. Joseph, and the Ephpheta, of Chicago, Ill., under the Religious of the Sacred Heart, illustrate the instruction afforded this afflicted class. Are you interested in their instruction, you will be specially impressed with the excellence of a cabinet carved in hard wood by three pupils of the Ephpheta and in the chair-caning and wood-carving from the first-named institution.

The work for outcasts and those exposed to courses of crime is strikingly brought out by the exhibit of the New York Catholic Protectory of Westchester. Its department for boys is under the Brothers of the Christian Schools and that for girls under the Sisters of Charity. These children are withdrawn from exposure to want, disease and crime on the street, furnished with home care and comforts and taught the elements of education and a trade at the same time.

The fulness and excellence of the collection from the Colored Industrial School of Pine Bluff, Ark., left no doubt of the earnest and persistent efforts there made for improvement. The exhibition

from the Indian schools gave evidence of progress both in letters and industries.

The collections from Catholic temperance societies called attention to the efforts in this great reform.

If space permitted much might be said of personal exhibits of special interest. There was a diminutive wood-saw run by a diminutive engine, all the work of an Indian boy in a school taught by the Sisters of St. Joseph. In several instances relief maps might be seen made by pupils. Brother Alexis, of Carlsbourg, Belgium, exhibited, among aids to the study of geography, a submersible relief map. The La Salle Institute, New York, exhibited a successful illustration made by one of its professors of the development of solids by the use of marked and folded paper. Here, again, were collections of woods, minerals, leather; of cotton from the seed to the finished fabric; of grain—to aid in nature studies, such as those from St. Peter's School, Philadelphia, and others. The visitor of scientific tastes possibly would find greater satisfaction in the collections illustrative of work in the polytechnic schools, the colleges and theological seminaries.

The Christian Brothers' College, Memphis, Tenn., may be mentioned as an illustration of the institutions which show the fulness of their courses step by step each year from the beginning in the preparatory department to the last of the senior studies in the four years of the college training.

The collection from Notre Dame University, Congregation of the Holy Cross, Notre Dame, Ind., was large and varied, and conveyed an idea of the grounds and appliances, as well as of the great variety of work done by the students in the different departments.

Manhattan College, New York City, made an exhibit which commanded the special attention of thoughtful visitors. Its several departments, including preparatory, business and the most advanced subjects taught, were well represented. Here was a translation in Latin of Grover Cleveland's inaugural address as President in 1893, and "Aristotle and the Christian Church," by Brother Azarias, whose death during the Exposition was so greatly lamented by all who knew him. From theological seminaries were examination papers in the most advanced theological subjects as well as Latin, Greek and Hebrew. A modest but instructive exhibit called attention to the Catholic University of America, at Washington, D. C. This university, intended to crown the entire system of Catholic education in the United States, has only a portion of its buildings erected and has opened fully only its theological department. Some work has been begun in philosophy. Realization of the purpose to bring here the most learned pro-

fessors to be found the world over, in the Catholic Church, in the subjects to be pursued, cannot fail to exert a powerful influence upon learning generally as well as upon all Catholic schools of whatever grade.

The text-books either published by Catholics or used in their schools were appropriately exhibited.

The Library of Catholic Literature attracted much attention.

The collection of books, letters, manuscripts, magazines, pictures, mitres, croziers, chalices, relics of priests, bishops, archbishops, cardinals and popes—articles associated with events or persons of special interest, illustrating the history of the Catholic Church and furnished from the Catholic historical collections of America, Notre Dame, Ind., and the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, specially attracted those disposed to historical inquiry. Here was a German Bible printed at Nuremburg in 1470; here was a copy of the first Catholic Bible printed in the United States, 1790, and the Bible used by Mother Seton, the first Sister of Charity in the United States, and a Catholic New Testament printed in English in 1682. Objects of special historic interest were also furnished from other institutions; from the Christian Brothers' College, Memphis, Tenn., a specimen of printing in 1633; a portion of the Bible for the blind; the "*Syntagma Juris Universi*," 1609; *Imitation of Christ*, 1699; a polyglot edition of the *Imitation of Christ*, in eight languages; "*Paradisus Animæ Christianæ*," printed in 1675; the Bible in Latin and German, with annotations in Greek, printed in 1671.

From the Josephinum College, Columbus, Ohio, there were noteworthy books, such as "*Saint Antoninus' Summa Theologica*," printed by Nicholaus Jensen, 1479. The "*Exercitium Grammaticale Puerorum*," in the Gothic characters, with an explanatory text in Latin, printed in Germany, 1504; the debate between Dr. Eck and Dr. Martin Luther on the primacy of the Roman pontiff, which occurred in July, 1519, of which the book is understood to be the original record printed in Leipsic immediately afterward; the "*Chronicle of the Old Christian Churches*," from Eusebius, printed at Strasbourg in 1530, understood to be one of the oldest and first histories printed in the German language.

Any notice of the exhibition would be incomplete which did not bring into view the exercises of Catholic Education Day. These were held in Festival Hall, Jackson Park, under the auspices of the Columbian Catholic Education Committee, Bishop Spalding President and Brother Maurelian Secretary and Manager, and were presided over by Archbishop Feehan, of Chicago, with whom upon the platform were a large number of the most distinguished prelates of the country, together with representatives of the Direc-

tor-General and the lady managers, and others. The attendance was large, both of clergy and laity, and especially of members of the teaching orders of men and women. The speaking was able; the sentiments were stimulating to patriotism and to greater devotion and enthusiasm to Catholic education as a need both of the State and the Catholic Church. Dr. S. H. Peabody, Chief of the Department of Liberal Arts, in the place of the Director-General, commended the wisdom and efforts which had brought together so great and so effective an exhibit of Catholic education and cared for it so efficiently and faithfully. "You have done admirably. I think of the thousands of fingers and of minds which have been employed all over this land in the preparation of this exhibit."

The utmost emphasis was placed upon religious education by the distinguished speakers. Archbishop Hennessey remarked: "Education without religion is not a good tree." "How can you study nature properly if you put out of it nature's God, or the lives of men when you make no account of Him?" Archbishop Ryan said: "The vocations of secular and religious education have much in common. Both are destined to dispel ignorance, to enlighten and enlarge the human mind so that it may contemplate truth more perfectly, to refine and elevate our love of the true, the beautiful and the good. These two educations are thus far united in vocation and mission. They ascend the mountain of God together, for all knowledge, whether religious or scientific, is holy; for God is master in the temporal as in the spiritual order—God of the starry firmament as well as of the sanctuary. Behold these two lovers of truth ascending the mountain together. At a certain point marked by a cross by the wayside the secular teacher stops and says: "Thus far may I go and no farther. I must return to bring pupils to this point and here part with them." "Do not go back but give me thy hand," says the religious educator; "to these summits above us bathed in celestial light, let us ascend and see what newer and greater things our God has made, and let us hear His voice speaking to us." "Education, to be perfect," he continues, "must consider man in his entirety; must call out the heart-power as well as intellect power, and educate the great religious element within us, as real as either and partaking of both; and again, the Catholic Church, with the maternal instinct for the preservation of the spiritual life of her children, knows no sacrifice too great to be made for their religious instruction. You behold the result. Thousands of school-houses surmounted by the Cross, and second only in importance to our churches, are seen throughout the land. Many religious orders of men and women are devoted to the same work. You behold at the Columbian Exhibition some of the visible results of this remarkable self-sacrifice for the

cause of education. You see how charity can do more than gold."

Hon. M. J. O'Brien, of the Supreme Court of New York, dwelling on the fruits of religious education, said: "This idea or principle which, we believe will finally meet with the assent and approval of all thoughtful, right-minded men, is the Catholic contribution to education. This does not, let us repeat, place itself in antagonism to our public schools, nor does it in any way include the right of the State to teach religion."

Hon. T. J. Gargan, of Boston, speaking of "Catholicity and Patriotism," called attention to the part taken by the Catholic Archbishop Langton in securing, on the field of Runnymede, at the hands of King John of England, the Magna Charta; and to the efforts of the Catholics in Maryland; to the fact that a Catholic in one of our Colonial congresses, when the right of the king was affirmed, arose and asked, "What about the divine rights of the people?" He quoted from St. Thomas Aquinas the declaration that "the ruler has not the power of making law except inasmuch as he bears the power of the multitude"; Sir Thomas More, as holding that the king held his crown by Parliamentary title; and Suarez, as teaching that "whenever civil power is found in one man or legitimate prince, by ordinary right, it came from the people and community either proximately or remotely; it cannot be otherwise possessed so as to be just"; and finally Belarmino, as saying "divine right gave the power to no particular man; it therefore gave the power to the multitude."

Bishop Spalding, in the midst of a few earnest remarks, said: "This system of ours is an opportunity of our religious life. What does America mean? It means boundless opportunities. That is the only meaning I have for America. If it is better than any other land, it is because here is a fuller opportunity to bring forth whatever makes man God-like; whatever makes him intelligent, moral, religious, praying, true, loving, beautiful, and fair—opportunity. That is America."

Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker greeted the assembly in behalf of the Lady Managers.

Manifestly it would be difficult to devise a more effective voicing or representative interpretation of the Catholic exhibit as "a great achievement." Whether the exhibit is to result in the establishment of a magazine devoted to the improvement of Catholic schools is not yet manifest.

Before leaving this great study, one wishes an answer to the question so often recurring at different points of investigation: How did all this come about? Certainly not by chance; not without difficulty and sacrifice; not without experience and a high order

of wisdom. The expense and management were wholly from the Church. No civil authority participated in it.

As the idea of the great Columbian Fair became more definite, it appears that several Brothers of the Christian Schools were conferring together, when it was suggested that the Catholic schools should participate in the exhibition—perhaps by Brother Maurelian. Certain it is that he had been officially called to bear an important part in the educational exhibit at New Orleans. The idea was approved by Archbishops Feehan and Ireland, and Hon. W. J. Onahan was requested to bring the matter to the attention of the archbishops at their meeting in Boston, July, 1890. The sanction of the Metropolitans was given, and a committee of their number called a conference of priests and religious orders and others interested. Several meetings of distinguished educators were held, and a circular was issued by a duly appointed committee to arouse general interest.

Progress was reported at the meeting of archbishops at St. Louis in December, 1891, and executive officers were designated. The learned and eloquent Bishop J. L. Spalding, of Peoria, Ill., was unanimously called to act as president, and the able and indefatigable Brother Maurelian, President of the Christian Brothers' College, Memphis, Tenn., was appointed secretary and manager. He had followed with great interest the effect of the New Orleans educational exhibit upon the schools of the country, and he was peculiarly prepared by nature and acquirements for the difficult task—able, scholarly, willing to work, courteous, of untiring patience, full of resources, quick to plan and to do, profoundly convinced of the unmeasured good to come from the exhibit, his fitness as general manager was never questioned, but heartily commended by all who had anything to do with him.

Bishop Spalding's masterly pen aroused enthusiasm. The highest authorities in the Church emphasized their approval.

Every courtesy was extended to the promoters of the exhibit by S. H. Peabody, LL.D., Chief of the Department of Liberal Arts, that was in his power, but the management of the Exposition was slow to provide adequately for education, and not a few educators became discouraged; but through all the period of uncertainty, Brother Maurelian's faith and patience were equal to the situation. The marvellous installation was effected, and the tide of visitors set in. No matter what differences and uncertainties arose to confuse, divert, or discourage, Brother Maurelian kept the end steadily in view. His plans were ready for every contingency.

By his forethought, the several orders, schools, and exhibits were fitted to the plan of awards, and the result is manifest in

the proportionately large number of medals and diplomas received. The largest and the smallest, the nearest and the most remote, exhibitor could bear testimony that no effort was spared on the part of the manager and his associates to do equal justice. Many mistakes were corrected. The most trivial questions of the curious visitors, the most exacting demands of the judges, were met cheerfully, at whatever cost of convenience and labor. Brother Maurelian, until the last act was closed, in spite of sleepless nights and loss of health, abated no one jot or tittle of required effort.

GEN. JOHN EATON, PH.D., LL.D.

THE RECENT DECREES ON CHURCH MUSIC.

TWO important documents on the subject of Church music have recently emanated from the Congregation of Sacred Rites. They were, first, a decree concerning the official editions of the choral books of the Church; and, second, a general Regulation in regard to the composition and execution of ecclesiastical music. Although both of these pronouncements were enclosed in a circular letter to the Bishops of Italy, it is proper to note here that they were of very unequal legal application; for while the *Regulation* was formally addressed only to the Ordinaries of the dioceses of Italy, and has therefore only a very limited legal scope, the decree on Gregorian chant concerns the whole Church.

However different in their import and scope, they may be considered as forming together a valuable exposition of the mind of the Holy See in a matter which has been the subject of very much controversy. The story of abuses in Church music is an old one. It has called forth comment and criticism, both clerical and lay.

And, perhaps, despite these recent utterances of the Sacred Congregation, the history shall still repeat itself; perhaps rigorist and laxist alike may find in them a desirable suffrage; and they may prove a demonstration to him who, with one ear open to the beauties of plain chant, ventures to think that he can catch with the other many suggestions of heavenly harmony in the sacred compositions of more modern schools of music. But it is confessed on all sides that there is a palpable necessity of some revision, some reformation—perhaps, literally an *orientation*—of the present state of Church music. While the professors and doctors are

fighting the question out on technical lines, be ours the humbler task to take merely a lay view of the subject, and to indulge, at the same time, some unscientific yearnings.

Any one who is familiar with the periodical Catholic literature of the last quarter of a century, must have noticed many a discussion—ranging from a few isolated paragraphs to the formal series of articles—of music-reform in the Church. The discussion was not always just, and was very rarely temperate. Perhaps it is inseparable from the reformer to be something of a zealot. But in addition, the tone adopted was not unfrequently merry and jocose. When Brutus had poured forth the torrent of his anger on Cassius, we remember how Shakespeare makes the quarrel assume the merry phase—and so, when reasoning seemed to have expended itself into failure, the modern Brutus of “reform” began to use the refractory Cassius of Church music, “for his sport, yea, for his laughter.” A rather unfortunate aspect of the quarrel began to develop itself, wholly outside of the manners, the “amenities” of the discussion. This was the fact—an unfortunate one, as we have just said—that no common ground was suggested for the desired reform. For there was, first of all, the implacable devotee of Gregorian Song, who rode in this modern tournament in the full panoply of a mediæval knight. He was the representative of venerable antiquity, of ecclesiastical discipline, and of a grand, unbroken tradition of liturgical glories. But too often, alas! his armor seemed to sit heavily upon him; his battle-cry seemed but an echo of syllogistic scholasticism; and so, although it might indeed draw its appropriateness from a very intelligible association of ideas, it fell as a strange idiom on the sense of a less reasoning age. Men may be convinced, but will rarely be moved, by a syllogism. Personally, we are not wholly disinclined to sympathize with his ideal. But we think that in such a matter as music, which is, in some respects, a question of taste, of æstheticism, it was inadvisable to cry out too strenuously and too insistently: *Aut Cæsar aut nullus*.

Then there was the advocate of the Palestrinesque style. He loved plain chant, but would not be exclusive in his preferences. The delights of a harmony whose tonalities and modal characteristics lifted it out of any vulgar association with present-day counterpoint, seemed to him not a thing to be only tolerated but to be desired as well in those temples which had erst heard but the simple unison of Gregorian chant. His principle might be stated in the words of Mr. Rockstro: “Since the downfall of the Polyphonic Schools the true Church style—the ‘Stilo alla Capella’ of the sixteenth century—has lain entirely dormant.”

Then there was the devout client of Palestrina, who, however,

imitated the "Prince of Church Musicians" afar off; who followed the grave, sweet style of the master, but did not disdain to confine himself wholly to modern modality. Plain chant and Palestrina were alliterations very dear to his musical sense, and represented to him all that was proper, pure, and pious in the performance of the musical part of the liturgy.

These three schools represented the major part of those who labored for "the proprieties" of divine service. The whole Catholic world felt their influence; and their progress in numbers and in power and in a most praiseworthy zeal for a genuine reform in Church music was signalized by the establishment of societies, schools and periodicals devoted to this one end of reform. In France the reform set in a tidal wave towards primitive plain chant. It was hotly urged that the only music to be tolerated in the churches was the Gregorian chant. Even the *style palestrinesque* was an infringement on the sacred prerogatives of the ancient melodies of the Church. Again, not even the official edition urged by the Holy See for adoption by all the churches was deemed a suitable return to the traditions of the Ages of Faith. The *primitive* chants of St. Gregory, indicated with much real acumen, and with the indefatigable labors of zealous antiquarians and archæologists (words, we are assured by one French writer on Church music, which possess in this matter a widely different meaning), were the only real Church music worth battling for.

In Germany (and in those lands which followed the more liberal scheme of reform inaugurated there by Dr. Proske, J. G. Mettenleiter and Director Schrems of the Ratisbon Cathedral), Palestrina, and his school, and a modern approach to his style, formed a cult growing side by side with the study of plain chant. The most significant name in this revival was that of Rev. Francis Witt, whose writings and whose musical compositions and great ability as an organizer and director of the Society of St. Cecilia, soon enrolled in its membership 10,000 zealous disciples from the provinces of Germany alone.

America followed next in order in the more moderate view of the scope of music-reform in the Church. Shortly after, Ireland declared allegiance to the new order. Other suffrages came pouring in to the new movement from all quarters. The society had its organs published now in many different tongues, and much enthusiasm spurred it on to further efforts.

As it is our purpose just at this place merely to refer to the different schools of reform, we may not tarry longer to speak of the details of their activity. All these schools were united in one thing, however,—their uncompromising hostility to the popular styles of music performed in the churches. Haydn, Mozart,

Beethoven, and their lesser imitators; Pacini, Cimarosa, and the whole Italian school; needless to say, "the god, Rossini;" even the semi-classical Pergolesi; Gounod, mystic, devotional; Cherubini, sweet and melodious; Weber, now cheerful, now sombre—these, and the many other names that are associated with the musical reminiscences of most church-goers, were swept aside from notice, sometimes with a laugh, sometimes with a sneer, sometimes with a labored apology.

Another phase of the reform movement presented itself in the labors of those who advocated congregational singing. The simplicity of plain chant and the simplicity of easy and popular hymn-tunes of the present day offered a feasible return to more devotional and edifying services in the Church. It was argued that the best reform would be obtained when the people themselves should be permitted to assume their ancient *rôle* and prerogative as an integral part of the ceremonial observances. To this end, not alone the modern, but even the polyphonic, schools must give place to unison congregational chants.

Meanwhile, the defenders of the existing order were not idle. Merriment was answered by merriment, tradition by tradition, æsthetics by æsthetics. *De gustibus* became a retort courteous to the epithets, "operatic," "trashy," "sensuous." Plain chant was relegated to seminaries and monasteries, Cecilian music was voted a bore. The polemic ink flowed freely. And side by side with the severest strains of the elder music the more modern, as well as the very modern, trills, *bravuras* and sensuous cadences continued with unabated prestige to charm the ears of—shall we say *congregation* or *audience*? As we are not taking sides, we shall beg the reader to select the term he likes best. We have been trying thus far to prepare the way for the reader to understand the significance of the recent authoritative utterances in this matter of church music—utterances which, we are assured, proceeded from a very careful consideration, and after a thorough discussion, of the matter by the Congregation of Rites in full session.

The general spirit of the *Regulation*, and, indeed, of the *Decree*, might be styled "tolerant" in a very high degree. The prophetic utterances of newspapers, the private knowledge of correspondents, the calm convictions of editors, all pointing to a rigorous return to Gregorian originals, received but slight fulfilment and slight encouragement from the event itself. Perhaps the most striking of all the journalistic predictions was an article in the *Journal des Débats*, published almost on the eve of the actual appearance of the documents themselves: "Pope Leo XIII. is preparing an encyclical in which, if we may credit the news from Rome, he would severely condemn the execution of worldly music (*des musiques*

profanes) in the churches and recall all Catholic maîtrises to the practice of a truly religious art. . . . The orchestra, introduced into the churches, is a misconception. All that tumult of instruments reverberating from stone walls shall never express confiding love, serene faith, and, to say all in one word, it shall never be a prayer. . . . The Roman or ogival vaulting of cathedrals is not suited for the splendors or graces of modern symphony. (The orchestra is only in place in certain present-day churches, which resemble theatres rather than temples)." The article from which the extract has been made is quite lengthy, and this fact shows the general interest felt in the forthcoming encyclical, which could make space in a secular journal for such a peculiarly religious topic treated in such an uncompromising spirit. The newspapers on this side of the Atlantic heralded the decrees with similar evidence of a deep and widespread interest—an interest which they partly satisfied and partly awakened. In view of this general notice given to the matter of church music, it will scarcely be amiss to review the decrees in question and to endeavor to point their moral.

THE DECREE.

The decree concerned itself with plain chant, and, specifically, with the official edition of the Roman choral books published by Pustet & Co. To understand the significance of this latest utterance of the Congregation of Rites, it will be necessary to review summarily the history of that reform movement in church music which contemplated both a restoration of the Gregorian melodies to a dignified, simple and devotional original, and a very desirable uniformity throughout the church in this part of her Liturgy.

In the course of the centuries which elapsed since the time of St. Gregory the Great, the official edition of the chants prepared by him—the celebrated Antiphonary, which he caused to be chained to the altar of St. Peter's as a standard for reference in future years—failed of the desired effect. For the system of notation employed in it—the *neumata* or *nota Romana*—however much of an advance over the labyrinthine musical semeiography of the Greeks, was itself open to the essential defect of a variable interpretation. Let the reader imagine a series of musical signs consisting of different combinations of the acute, grave and circumflex accents, possessing not a grammatical but a musical value and subject to those changes in form, which, in the course of time, a hasty, careless chirography or an artistic but variant calligraphy cannot fail to produce, and he will begin to understand some of the difficulties thrown in the way of an absolute standard of Gregorian chant. Add to this the absence of a staff, and,

in the begining, of even a single line above the text to be sung, and the consequent uncertainty of the distances separating the notes from each other, which brought in a new element of difficulty in addition to the uncertain determination of the names of the notes. The tradition must be perfect to an extraordinary degree, which should preserve unaltered the original chants of St. Gregory. In the lapse of years we find that the chant must have reached a highly variant condition, if that remark of a certain Monk of Triers, quoted by Gerbert, was not wholly a witticism, that "the same marks which Master Trudo sung as thirds, were sung as fourths by Master Albinus, and Master Solomo in another place asserts the fifths to be the notes meant, so that at last there were as many methods of singing as teachers of the art."

This indeterminateness was partially removed by the placing of a line above the text, and subsequently by the addition of a second line, in the tenth century. To these Guido of Arezzo added two other lines, forming the present four-lined staff of Gregorian chant. By placing the *neumata* on and between the lines he secured that definiteness which could alone remove the former ambiguous character of notation. He was also the inventor of a method of teaching the chants and of training chanters which, compared to the former vogue, must have been simplicity itself. For in a single lesson by his method he taught the reigning Pontiff, Pope John XIX., how to sing at sight an unknown melody—an achievement which would have proved almost a life task to the theorists of his time.

At last, one might conclude, plain chant was placed in such a commanding position of intelligibility and feasibility as to ensure a universally correct and unique rendition of it. But alas! side by side with these reforms in notation there was growing up the young art of harmony, which was destined ultimately to use the Gregorian melodies as a mere background for an infinitely varying play of tonal lights and shadows, and which was to employ their gracefully unequal rhythms as foundation-stones, heavy and rudely shaped into an unmeaning similarity of rhythm, for a superstructure of renaissant fancifulness rich in splendid marbles and delicate tracery. It is not to be wondered at if the chant suffered thus much alteration. The rude *organum* of Hucbald could not but take away much of its free recitative rhythm. Then came the harmonic advance of the *faux bourdons*, in which, at first, as in the *organum*, the chant melody was dominantly heard. Gradually, however, parts were placed over the melody, and while the chant "dragged its slow length along"—very much like the wounded snake of Pope's Alexandrine—a melodic character was given to the accompanying parts by making them move, not note

for note with the chant as formerly, but in unequal measures. Thence arose the *discant*—discantus or double song—which, in the course of time, emerged from its babyhood of Gregorian leading-strings into the full-grown estate of an *aria*, or *air*, for which, by the way, the word *discant* was used in earlier English. We need not speak just here of the further liberties taken with the chant melodies by the contrapuntal treatment which soon followed the *discant*, and which, while at times using the melodies as fundamental to the arabesque harmony, at other times varied it and overlaid it beyond recognition. Then began that series of abuses with which the history of modern music is more immediately concerned; which called forth decree after decree from the Church; which have not, indeed, a perfect, but—in some respects—a similar counterpart in the abuses which called forth the *regulations* recently issued by the Congregation of Sacred Rites.

But now, confining our attention to the significance of the *decree* concerning, not modern music, but plain chant, we can begin to understand how, in the lapse of ages, the original chants of St. Gregory, as well as the proper manner of performing them, became altered very materially; how the various “uses” of different dioceses grew up and flourished; how not merely the melodies themselves suffered, now additions, now curtailments, now manifold mutilation, but how the execution became largely a matter of the personal taste of choir-masters; and how, finally, in some places, it approached to the freedom and gayety of modern rhythms and melodies, and in other places sank into a dull, monotonous, unrhythmical, and therefore unmelodic, declamation.

The recent decree reminds us that the Holy See always viewed this gradual corruption of the chants with alarm. Whatever toleration and acceptance of nascent harmony there was on her part, she desired that the chant itself should remain true to the traditions of the elder simplicity and rhythm. A decree issued by Pope John XXII., at Avignon, in the year 1322, states very well the apprehensions excited by the performances of the *déchanteurs* of that time, and the desire on the part of the Church that the integrity of the chant should not be lessened. “Some disciples of the new school, whilst they are careful to measure their time, invent new notes of their own, which they elect to sing in semi-breves and minims in preference to the ancient notation of the chant. They cut up the melody with interruptions, they overload it with *descant*, and with triplets and vulgar ornamentations they sometimes disfigure it; so that they appear to despise the foundations of the Gradual and Antiphonary. They know not on what foundations they are building. They cannot distinguish the tones (modes); yea, they confound them, since, by the multitude

of their notes, the modest ascents (*ascensiones pudicæ*) and temperate descents (*descensiones temperatæ*) of the plain chant, by which the modes are distinguished, are obscured. They execute in gestures what they wish to convey, so that the devotion to be sought after is condemned, and the wantonness which should be avoided is propagated. We have determined, therefore, to correct this and to drive out of the Church of God this gross abuse. Wherefore we enjoin that no one henceforward shall presume to attempt such or similar liberties with the music of the Church, especially during the Divine Office or during the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. . . . By this we do not intend to convey that sometimes, especially on festival days, in Solemn Mass and in the Divine Office, some consonances may not be employed which are melodious and based upon the plain chant; so, however, that the integrity of the chant itself may remain unaltered, and that nothing of this well-measured music be changed."¹ Other and worse abuses followed, which we need not refer to now, and which called forth a decree from the Council of Trent concerning rather polyphonic music than plain chant.²

But the spirit of liturgical reform was abroad, and in the domain of the ancient ecclesiastical chant found much to engage its attention. The hundreds of local and variant "uses," while succeeding at times in adding to the body of chants some melodies of rare beauty, were really in the nature of so many abuses in liturgy. They partially took away from the liturgy its significance as a unique and universal expression of the unity of the Church. But apart from the question of liturgical unity, these uses were, even in a musical sense, deserving of the name of abuses. We have already heard the lament of the monk of Triers, quoted by Gerbert. Strong of language as he was in his witty moods, he was little less so in his serious moments. "We are perfectly sure," he wrote, "that through the ignorance of some the chant is very often corrupted in such wise that there are now more perverters of it than we can number." In addition to those whose ignorance or carelessness or vanity tended to the gradual extinction of the old melodies, there were the mediæval composers, who furnished, in the chants they composed for new offices, endless contradictions to the spirit and character of the original chants of St. Gregory. This state of musical and liturgical decadence called forth the energetic labors of Pope Pius V. Desiring to carry out practically the reforms indicated by the Council of Trent, he ordered a complete revision of the Antiphony and the other liturgical

¹ *Extravag. Comm.*, lib. iii., tit. i. Trans. in *Echo*, vol. i., No. 5.

² Ab ecclesiis vero musicas eas, ubi sive organo, sive cantu lascivum aut impurum aliquid miscetur . . . arceant (sc. episcopi).

books. Under his successor, Gregory XIII., Palestrina, who also figures in the history of music as the Prince of Musicians and the Saviour of Modern Ecclesiastical Music, was charged with the immense burden of this work of critical investigation and correction. It is questioned whether the genius and temper of mind of Palestrina were suited to such a task, and, indeed, whether his learning fitted him for the decision of nice questions which had not a little flavor of antiquarianism lingering around them. At all events, certain it is that his work, while it met the approval of the Pope, has added but questionable laurels to his crown. He completed a portion of the *Graduale* chants, while he entrusted to his pupil, Guidetti, the task of revising and editing the *Antiphonary*. "The difficulty of the task was so great," writes Mr. Rockstro, "that the 'Princeps Musicæ' left it unfinished at the time of his death; but with the assistance of his friend, Guidetti, he accomplished enough to render his inability to carry out the entire scheme a matter for endless regret." Quite a different view of his work is taken by Th. Nisard: "Unhappily, in comparing the chants of the *Graduale* with those of the *Antiphonarium*, Palestrina believed it necessary to reduce the former to the simplicity of the latter. The Pope shared the opinion of the *prince of musicians*, but the result was far from the hopes which both had conceived; 'for,' says M. Fétis, 'after the suppression of all the ornamental notes which have been thought to belong to the first drafting of the chant, there remained only dry and monotonous melodies.'"

An edition of the *Antiphonary* published at Venice in 1580, known as the Lichenstein edition, gave a new turn to the activity of Guidetti, who published soon after his *Directorium Chori*.

Other editions followed. In 1599 the celebrated printer of Antwerp, Plantin, brought out the *Graduale*, known as the *Editio Plantiniana*. In 1615 appeared the splendid Medicean edition of the same chants. "These fine editions are now exceedingly scarce; but the necessity for a really good series of Office-Books, obtainable at a moderate price, has long been felt, and several attempts have been made to meet the exigencies of the case." The present century has witnessed a marvellous revival of interest in the study of Plain Chant.

The interest has been antiquarian, classical, devotional, æsthetic. The need has been felt, not only of cheaper editions, but of a single authoritative edition which should be a practical exposition of the best traditions of Gregorian Chant, and should by its adoption in all the Churches, manifest the unity of the Church Liturgy in this very essential portion of it. But alas! as often happens in the case of revivals and reforms, the revivalists and reformers are too apt to ride individual and opposing hobbies to death; the spirit

of schools, the *esprit de corps* of narrow circles, the traditional "uses" of various dioceses and the venerable character conferred on them by age and associations, the warring elements of nationality, the peculiar views of savants and antiquarians—all these disturbing and refractory influences have brought about a confusion worse than the earlier errors. And so there appeared (in several senses) *wrong editions* of the Chant.

In 1848 a Gradual and Vespéral were published at Mechlin (Malines), edited by the Abbé de Voght and Duval, with episcopal sanction. This was followed by an edition prepared by Père Lambillotte and his continuator Père Dufour. A commission appointed by the Archbishops of Rheims and Cambrai produced another edition. The Mechlin edition did not go beyond the limits of the Medicean and Plantinian editions, and was therefore quite modern compared both with the work of the Cambrai editors, who based their work on the famous MS. of Montpellier of the 10th century, and with the labors of Lambillotte, who went back to even earlier centuries in an endeavor to find the most authentic chants. The controversies aroused by both of these attempts at a simplified chant were heated and prolonged. A large discussion of their respective merits is given in M. Félix Clément's *Histoire Générale de la Musique Religieuse*, who awards the palm of merit to Père Lambillotte's work. France was especially prolific in new and extremely variant editions. Concerning the editions of Rennes, of Dijon, of Digne, and of Malines (Mechlin) of 1848, 1854, 1855, M. Clément has not a very encouraging word to say; they all are, according to him, only "le chant momifié." And he laments that the only apparent fruit of the many attempts at another authoritative edition of the Chants was the existence in France alone, of six or seven different revisions of the Chant—not (let us add on our own account) to speak of the manner of execution!

Pope Pius the IX. had very much at heart the unification of the Chant, and its identification with the version used in the Roman Church. He accordingly desired the Congregation of Sacred Rites to deal with the matter; and the Congregation established a commission of men well versed in the theory and history and traditions of the Gregorian Chant, to take up the question, and edit a complete series of Liturgical Books which should be authoritative. The Medicean and Venetian (Lichtenstein) editions were followed—the former for the Gradual, and the latter for the Chants of the Divine office. Herr Pustet of Ratisbon placed at the disposal of the congregation all the magnificent resources of his great publishing house, with the result of a series of Liturgical works unexcelled in elegance of typography.

The Pope urged on all the Bishops of the world the immediate adoption of this "genuine, complete, official edition" of the choral books, "in order that the desired uniformity in the sacred liturgy should obtain in the chant as well, *ut exoptata uniformitas in S. Liturgia, etiam in cantu obtinere valeat*." Many dioceses followed the expressed will of the Pontiff, notably, the Synods of Westminster (1873), and of Maynooth (1875).

But the antiquary was abroad! His spirit was, we think, well indicated in the desire expressed by M. Nisard, that there should be a return to the Roman chant, "*lorsque celui ci sera convenablement restauré*." He insists, in a footnote, on the word *convenablement*—"Nous insistons sur cette condition." These words, written before the appearance of the official edition, and long before the decree authenticating and urging it, might well have been a prophecy of the storms of opposition raised since in certain quarters against that edition. It was urged that only the genuine chants of antiquity should be made authoritative, and that the editors of the Medicean and Venetian (Lichtenstein) books were not in a position to discover the true ancient melodies. The discovery of new manuscripts in our own century, the spirit of inquiry and painstaking investigation, the better equipment of the modern archæologist for the determination of authentic chants, the widespread interest excited in the work—all these constituted so many pleas against the formal acceptance by the Holy See and the consequent imposition upon all the churches of editions which, it was claimed, represented the comparative ignorance and ill-formed taste of a locality and an epoch. The commission of cardinals established by Pius IV. for the practical accomplishing of the resolution of the Council of Trent concerning the reform of the liturgical chant fell under the censure of one devotee of the "most ancient" chant. One of the most influential members of the commission, St. Charles Borromeo, did not, said his French critic, understand the Gregorian chant at all! "and so a gross error was committed 300 years ago, and the ecclesiastical chant has suffered ever since from the incapacity of the cardinals in this matter"!

To understand the insistence of the Holy See on this edition, it is proper to call to mind the fact that the pretence is not made that it represents exactly the original chants of St. Gregory. This, indeed, is a question for the antiquary to settle. But the Congregation of Rites simply sets the seal of approbation on an amended and reformed chant, such as the Council of Trent desired when it suggested "that the chant should be reduced to a simpler and apter form, that so it might be received and adopted the more readily by those who were concerned with divine psalmody" (*ut cantus*

ejus modi ad aptiorem simplicioremq̃ue formam reduceretur, et ita ab omnibus divinæ psalmodiæ operam dantibus recipi adoptariq̃ue facile possset.

At the risk of fatiguing the reader (but with an apologetic desire for clearness) we venture to quote largely from the decree of the 10th of April, 1883, in answer to the complaints urged against the official edition. After speaking of the sanction given by Pope Pius IX. to the choral books published under his auspices, this decree continues:

“Meanwhile, several admirers of ecclesiastical music began to inquire more deeply as to the original form of Gregorian chant and the various phases of its existence in the course of centuries. But they unwisely exceeded the limits of this investigation, and, carried away, perhaps, by an undue reverence for antiquity, appeared to neglect the recent ordinances of the Apostolic See and its wishes, so frequently manifested to introduce uniformity of chant according to the form sanctioned by the most prudent use of the Roman Church. They, forsooth, considered that putting aside the standard already wisely established, they were at liberty to strive that the Gregorian Chant should be brought back to its primitive form, and with the further intention that the Apostolic See, however it might declare authentic and strongly recommend the chant of the edition recently approved by it, would not impose it of necessity on the several churches; they failed to remember, as indeed they should have done, that it is the constant practice of the Supreme Pontiffs, when there is a question of removing abuses, to act rather by persuasion than by command, especially as they know full well that the bishops and priests are piously and religiously accustomed to interpret the Pope's exhortations as a command. As these opinions were being widely circulated through the newspaper press and in numerous pamphlets published on the subject, and calling into question the nature of the approbation given to the above-mentioned edition, the Sacred Congregation considered it a duty to declare the apostolic letters already published by Pius IX., of sacred memory, authentic, and again to confirm the approbation of the said edition by a new decree issued on the 14th of April, 1877.

“Nevertheless, neither in this decree nor in the subsequent apostolic letters of our most Holy Father, above mentioned, were they willing to acquiesce; on the contrary, they continued to promote their views still more actively in a congress of upholders of ecclesiastical chant, which was held last year in Arezzo whilst public honors were being paid to the monk Guido, and not without giving offence to those who justly deem that the authority of the Holy See is to be exclusively followed in the method and uni-

formity of its chant not less than in other matters affecting the sacred liturgy. But, whatever may have been intruded into that congress which may merit disapprobation, those who met at Arezzo drew up certain resolutions, or *postulata*, to be humbly laid before our most Holy Father, Leo XIII., seeking his direction. Our most Holy Father, considering the gravity of the matter, commissioned a special body of certain cardinals, selected from those who constitute the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and certain prelates, officials of the same congregation, to examine into the question. This special congregation assembled at the Vatican on the under-mentioned date, and, having carefully considered the subject, examined all documents referring thereto and taken the opinions of learned men, thus decreed, subject to the approbation of the Supreme Pontiff.

"The *Vota* or *Postulata*, adopted in the Congress of Arezzo last year, with the object of bringing back the liturgical chant to ancient tradition, and submitted to the Apostolic See, cannot, as they are worded, be received or approved of. For, although it always has been, and ever will be, open to students of ecclesiastical chant, for erudition's sake, to investigate the old, original forms of the chant and its successive phases—just as men learned in other departments are accustomed, with the happiest results, to discuss and investigate concerning the old rites of the Church and the several parts of the liturgy—nevertheless, that form only of Gregorian chant is to be held to-day as authentic and legitimate which, according to the Tridentine sanctions by Paul V., Pius IX., of sacred memory, and our most Holy Father, Leo XIII., and by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, has been ratified and confirmed, as in accordance with the edition recently published at Ratisbon, and alone containing that form of chant used by the Roman Church. Wherefore, as regards this authenticity or legitimacy, there can be no further doubt or question amongst those who sincerely wish to respect the authority of the Holy See. Moreover, in order that the chant which is used in the Sacred Liturgy, in the strict sense of the term, may be uniform everywhere, in all the new editions of missals, rituals, pontificals, etc., those parts which require to be printed with musical notes must be executed in accordance with the aforesaid edition, approved by the Holy See, because containing the liturgical chant proper to the Roman Church (as the title affixed to each volume declares), and be perfectly conformable to that text. For the rest, although according to the most prudent course always adopted by the Holy See when there is question of introducing uniformity in the liturgy, she may not impose the use of this edition on every church, nevertheless, she again strongly exhorts all most reverend ordi-

naries and others interested in ecclesiastical chant that they be solicitous to adopt this edition, as many places have already praiseworthy adopted it in order to promote uniformity of chant in the Sacred Liturgy, and thus it decreed on the 10th day of April, 1883.

"A report of these proceedings being submitted by the undersigned secretary to our most Holy Father, Leo XIII., Pope, his Holiness approved and confirmed the decree of the Sacred Congregation and ordered it to be published on the 27th of the same month and year."¹

One might reasonably have supposed that this pronouncement would definitely settle the disputes. But the endless arabesques of the elder chants (one apologist asserts that the old manuscripts cited by the critics exhibit in ten instances four hundred and ninety-one notes, whereas the Medicean edition has reduced them to sixty) seemed still to prove too powerful an attraction! And, accordingly, new disputes arose. The decree issued this year insists on the declaration of the former decree of a decade ago, and as far as decrees and exhortations can go the question of official liturgical chant is finally settled.

This decree, then, expresses the will of the Holy See with regard to all the churches, but does not impose that will as an obligation. Nevertheless, it seems to us, such an expressed desire should suffice instead of an obligation; and whatever progress be made in the determination of the exact chants of St. Gregory, whatever wealth of ancient glories be brought to light through the zealous labors of the antiquarian or the archæologist, whatever spur be given by those labors to an increased love for the *official* chant of the Church, an awakened interest in its career, a laudable wish to place it in an honored position before the people—all these desirable ends should never be permitted to obscure that one practical, authoritative means to a unity of liturgical observances proposed by the Holy See in issuing its official edition of the Roman chant. Those who are zealous lovers of the chant and who would gladly see it assume its old, exclusive rôle as the only musical drapery of the liturgical texts, shall find a large field for their energies in the propagation of one accepted edition. With this desideratum before them they need not stick at little points of traditional musical etiquette.

THE REGULATION.

Accompanying the above decree, which was in Latin, there was also in the circular letter to the bishops of Italy a *Regolamento* (regulation) concerning the style and execution of music at litur-

¹ Trans in *Echo*, vol. i, No. 12.

gical functions and at extra-liturgical ceremonies and devotions, concerning the use of the organ, and concerning the promotion of the study of ecclesiastical music and the removal of abuses. This regulation was in Italian. Its formal scope included only the dioceses of Italy; but while it contemplates a status of music peculiar in some respects to that country, nevertheless its provisions should be considered a valuable indication of the attitude of the Holy See towards church music in general. That such is, indeed, the common interpretation of the document is evidenced by the wide interest it has excited. If this interest should promote the adoption, by all the choir-masters in our own land, of what we may choose to consider its suggestions, rather than its rules, a large gain could not fail to accrue to the cause of sacred music.

The decree has been styled "tolerant"—perhaps it would have been better to call it prudently practical. It will not tolerate anything which the circumstances of the people, the locality and the divine ceremonial would indicate to be against piety or propriety; it does not, even permissively, sanction indecorum in the music. But it does take into account the difficulties and perplexities of many a bishop and priest and choir-master in certain localities—difficulties and perplexities which are to be met with even in our own favored land, blessed though it generally be with abundance of financial means and with the absence of hampering immemorial traditions. Zeal is a mighty lever; but it will not move the world with a sudden force; it will not furnish scientifically competent organists and choir-masters to churches that cannot pay them enough salary; it cannot succeed in the creation of a spontaneous love for that which is commonly voted a bore; it cannot afford to disregard the world-wide fact of a difference in æsthetic appreciations. It should, indeed, "reach from end to end powerfully"; but it must "dispose all things sweetly." It must not insist on the immediate attainment of a presently unattainable ideal, nor encourage the weak to greater exertion through ridicule or castigation. A vast stride towards the popularizing of beauty is the demonstration of beauty. This course will, slowly, perhaps, but surely, have its proper effect in the culture of excellent standards, and with this gradual diffusion of an educated taste will grow also a desire for its legitimate satisfaction. But let not the zealous become a zealot—he will surely defeat his own end. We have seen it gravely stated by one such that Palestrina, the prince of church musicians, whose style has become the type for the most approved of sacred compositions and whose music is the *ultima Thule* of sacred polyphony, whose polyphonic chants the *Regolamento* considers "degnissima della casa di Dio" ("most worthy of the house of God")—even the divine Palestrina was

“one of the greatest destroyers of piety amongst the faithful”—not by his life (for he was a singularly pious and devout and humble child of the Church, and enjoyed the friendship and spiritual ministrations of St. Philip Neri) but by his music! “We think,” says this critic, “that one would do well, despite the enthusiasm of certain choir-masters, to limit himself to having the music of Palestrina heard in the conservatories and in those reunions known by the singular name of *concerts spirituels*. This music may be religious in a general sense, but it is not Catholic. It will no more replace our *introits*, our *kyrie*, our *sanctus*, our responses in plain chant than a sweet *meditation* of Lamartine or a fine page of Chateaubriand will take the place of a sermon.” This is the spirit which gives us the modern cult of the lifeless and rigid forms of the pre-Raphaelites. Indeed, our critic puts Raphael—him of the modest brush—together with Palestrina in the same sweeping denunciation, “Raphaël, Palestrina, ont été les grands destructeurs de la piété chez les fidèles.”

The *Regolamento* is a witness to the zeal of the Church for the proprieties of ceremonial liturgy. But its freedom from the *minutiae* of very specific directions concerning music and musicians has, we understand, subjected it to the criticism that its enunciation of general truths is but a “beating of the air.” The criticism is, in view of the history of recent legislation in sacred music, really a confession. It is a confession of the unwisdom of extreme paternalism. Again is the necessity of a practical zeal demonstrated!—a zeal which does not expend itself in an impossible multiplicity of legal detail nor place on the backs of men an unbearable burden. What has been the experience of the Holy See in this very matter?

Some ten years ago the Congregation of Rites issued, with the full approval of the Pope, a similar series of rules, “to remedy effectually the grave abuses which have crept into the sacred music performed in the various churches in Italy.” They were very far from indulging in that stringent and impracticable detail of which we have been speaking, and were generally regarded by the “moderate” school of music-lovers as a triumphant refutation of extremism. Yet even this “tolerant” regulation was found to be unsuited to the circumstances of certain localities in Italy. The present *Regolamento* is, accordingly, meant to temper the moderate detail of the former: “Although the regulation in regard to church music, issued to the Italian Episcopate by the Sacred Congregation of Rites on September 24, 1884, by Papal authority, contained,” says the recent Circular Letter enclosing the *Regolamento*, “many instructive rules for that important part of the liturgy of the Church, the difficulties as regards their exact observance which

have occurred in a large number of dioceses are not a few, nor are they inconsiderable.

"In order to remove these obstacles and to insure that the music in every church may be worthy of the House of God, the Holy Father, having caused the principal masters of the art of music to be consulted, and the opinions of several bishops in various parts of Italy to be ascertained, arranged that the Congregation of Rites itself, in full session, should take this important matter into consideration and indicate what needs clearer explanation or alteration in the said rules, and what modifications should be made in order that the desired end may be more easily attained."¹

The recent series of rules places, therefore, a desirable standard before us, points out what may be considered legitimate in church music, decries abuses, exhorts to increased zeal in the promotion of sacred music; but instead of loading itself down with impracticable legislative details, remains, for the most part, content with general directions.

The *Regolamento* consists of two parts; a series of twelve "General Regulations," and a series of four "Instructions to Promote the Study of Sacred Music and Remove Abuses."²

ARTICLE I.—Every musical composition harmonizing with the spirit of the accompanying sacred function, and religiously corresponding with the meaning of the rite and the liturgical words moves the faithful to devotion, and is therefore worthy of the House of God.

ARTICLE II.—Such is the Gregorian chant which the Church regards as truly her own, and which is accordingly the only one adopted in the liturgical books of which she approves.

ARTICLE III.—The polyphonic chant, as also the chromatic chant, rendered in the style above indicated, may likewise be suited to public functions.

ARTICLE IV.—In the polyphonic style the music of Pier-Luigi da Palestrina, and of his faithful imitators, is recognized as most worthy of the House of God; as regards chromatic music, that which has been transmitted to us down to the present day by recognized masters (*accreditati Maestri*) of the various Italian and foreign schools, and particularly of Roman masters (*Maestri Romani*), whose compositions have often been much praised by competent authority as truly religious (*veramente sacre*), is also worthy of divine worship.

A large principle is enunciated in Article I. Those who are

¹ The London *Tablet*, August 25, 1894.

² For the translation of this regulation, and of that of 1884, we are indebted to the London *Tablet*.

familiar with the controversies of the last few years concerning the kind of music which should be deemed suitable for divine service, will immediately appreciate its largeness. The Church does not insist on the use of plain chant at all of her liturgical ceremonies. Indeed, she never has done so in the past. Neither does she only "tolerate" figured music. On the contrary, an honored place is given to it by this official pronouncement, as well as by the testimony of her past history, and the present approved practice in the very seat of her dominion. Recognition is given to the most patent of all facts in æsthetics, that there may be several types, and therefore several standards of beauty. Customs, traditions, personal predilections, the temperament—all these are elements in the fashioning both of types of the beautiful and of a correct appreciation of those types as models for imitation. Those who insist on a single type of music for divine service, reason too often on *a priori* grounds, as though man were made for the Sabbath, and not the Sabbath for man. And unfortunately these *a priori* grounds are in reality sometimes merely geographical, and sometimes merely temperamental. The Church, on the other hand, is catholic; and so she cannot afford to impose on all her children the tastes of one locality or the predilections of one class of physical temperament. The endeavor to do so would involve her in endless perplexities. She has surely a large enough mission before her in her divine task of engrafting the supernatural upon the natural, without embarrassing her efforts by the impossible attempt to radically change the natural.

To give an illustration: The poles of musical appreciation are to be found in what are popularly called the German and Italian styles. Generally speaking, the one may be called harmonic, the other melodic—the one grave, majestic, calm; the other light-hearted, merry, enthusiastic. The one is a deep-flowing river, which bears in its broad bosom the songs of many tributary streams; the other is a brook, singing, not a deep but a loud chant; not a many-toned anthem, but a single lay. If the writer might intrude in this place his own predilection, he would unhesitatingly choose the former. But he knows that diversity of temperament seeks diversity of ministration. He remembers that to the large-hearted and tender-souled old Doctor Johnson all music was but a *noise*—although "the least disagreeable of noises"; that Hudibras was but a type of them for whom

"Discords make the sweetest airs";

that, with Jessica, some are "never merry" when they "hear sweet music"; that for others, music but

"— brings sweet sleep down from the blissful skies."

He can therefore understand the following remarks of a magazine published in Italy,¹ in an article treating of this *Regolamento*:

"One of the most illustrious men of Germany, skilled in sacred music, was several times present in the churches in Rome during the singing of the litany of the Blessed Virgin. He found fault with it, as though its melody were wholly unfit for fostering piety. He said it was like the songs which the street-sweepers, or such scurvy representatives of the lowest class, sing in the highways, commonly called *tarantella*. Nevertheless, throughout all Italy, you will scarce find another style of song which is more suited either for fostering devotion to our common Mother in Heaven, or for lifting the heart to God in a more salutary fashion. But now, on the other hand, a certain very illustrious representative of the Roman Church, after hearing this censure *usque ad nauseam*, went to Germany, and listened often to the melody of the same Litany in use there, than which there is, in the opinion of all the inhabitants, nothing fitter for exciting pious feelings of devotion. He considered the music not unlike that which Italians call a *ninna-nanna* (lullaby), and especially the prolix and endless *bitte für uns*. Which of these two had the better reason on his side? Neither, we say. The Italian Litanies are the best and most devotional—but for Italians; in the same way, the German Litanies are the best and most devotional—but for Germans. Transfer the Italian Litany to Germany, or the German Litany to Italy, and you will experience the reverse. The melody is the same, but the character of the people is different, and therefore opposite effects are produced. How, then, should different peoples be nourished by the same food when they possess different kinds of stomachs? What is appetizing and nourishing to some, serves but to disgust others, so that they remain without food and grow weaker. Would that the reformers understood this and held their peace."

This apology for Italian tastes in sacred music reminds us that every nationality has more or less characteristic likes and dislikes. Both of the typical characters quoted above in opposition to each other would probably agree in a common scorn of the ordinary tastes of Americans. Certainly, if the songs of the people be an indication of their musical taste, we have very little to congratulate ourselves upon—neither the gravity of the German folk-songs nor the light-hearted melodiousness of the Italian *canzoni popolari*. And so the apology which the Italian makes in the matter of music finds a greater scope in our own case. But the grand principle behind all the national tastes is that they are expressions of the popular genius. If music has a mission appealing to men's emo-

¹ *Ephemer. Liturg.*, September, 1894.

tions and sympathies, it must adapt itself to those sympathies rather than run counter to them. This view has the suffrages of saints as well as philosophers. St. Charles Borromeo was a foremost figure amongst those who pleaded and labored for the retention of figured music in the churches at a time when the abuses introduced by that very music were incomparably more flagrant than they are to-day: and when a zealous spirit of reform, sweeping like a tidal-wave over Catholic Europe, seemed desirous of leaving in its path only the most enduring landmarks of ancient traditions, St. Philip Neri, the prudent ascetic of the same era, the wise reader of the signs of those times, took advantage of the new music to win young men to the services held in his oratory. His sermons and instructions were interspersed with popular hymns—*Laudi Spirituali*—and with acts of sacred musical dramas, subsequently called, from the place of their performance, oratorios. These services became thus so popular that three volumes of *Laudi* were published by his Maestro di Capella, the saintly Animuccia. Little wonder that St. Philip should have been thought able to drive his penitents to heaven in a coach-and-four!

Doubtless there are limits to be considered in this condescension to popular tastes. On the one hand, the rubrics and liturgical proprieties must be observed; and, on the other, the tastes of the people may be quickened to an appreciation of better art. But after the many attempts at a unique style of church music have been compelled to confess as many failures, it would seem to be a wise course for musical reformers to seek the amelioration, rather than the abolition, of existing styles of sacred song.

It will be noticed that the *Regolamento* proudly places the Roman, Gregorian chant, first in the list of that kind of music which is worthy of the House of God. It should be unnecessary to speak at length of a subject around which has grown up such a large and appreciative literature. It has been discussed from all points of view—liturgical, devotional, musical, practical, æsthetic (and what has been illogically and unjustly confounded therewith), sentimental. The indefatigable presses have developed volumes; the quarterlies, reviews; the magazines, articles; the newspapers, paragraphs; the social company, loquacity, on this venerable and majestic theme. But this last phrase reminds the writer that he is taking sides in a discussion which is not all laudatory. For there be those who, in the sincerity of a holy zeal, would suggest the immediate rejection from the divine service of all music but plain chant; and those who, in the sincerity of a prudent zeal, counsel a temporizing policy, *meliora sperantes*, until such time as the gradual rehabilitation of the ancient Song in the Courts of the Lord shall have sufficiently educated head and heart to an appre-

ciation of and a consequent longing for it; and others who, in the sincerity of a liberal view, would have a complete fraternization of both ancient and modern song in the Church; and, last of all, there be those who, in the sincerity of a profound ignorance, find in Gregorian chant only a crude relic of barbarous ages, an unscientific germ of a great science, an unmusical groping after music, an unrhythmical foreshadowing of the limpid forms and liquid measures of Haydn and Mozart—in a word, a “child” which, in a sense as unworthy as it is un-Wordsworthian, “is father to the man.”

In the first and the last of these classes extremes meet. We have already heard the lament of that critic who considered Palestrina “one of the greatest destroyers of piety amongst the faithful”; and if some of our readers will take the trouble to measure their own sentiment in the matter, perhaps they shall not be compelled to go far in search of the other extreme. A word in this place concerning the chant may not, therefore, be amiss.

First of all, judgment should not be passed on a caricature. The chant, as often heard, is indeed “plain”—a veritable parody. Some weight must be allowed to the educated and cultured taste of those musicians of all schools of music and all shades of religious belief and unbelief, who—to select typical names—like Gounod, Wagner, Mendelssohn, Rousseau, have found it proper to praise plain chant in very characteristic and highly eulogistic fashion. They were so fortunate as to hear it fairly executed, or so expert as to read in its printed pages the secret of its beauty.

Secondly, it is wholly unlike modern music. It is rhythmical, but not mathematically so, as modern music is. It has (practically) eight different modes, each possessing, like our two modern major and minor modes, a different character which those accustomed to it for a long time perceive as acutely as we do the characteristic tonalities of our two modern modes. It is therefore richer in one respect than modern music.

Thirdly, it is intended to be a mere drapery clothing the majestic forms of the liturgical texts. Unlike modern music, it is to be, not the master, but the slave, of the text. It receives its accent, not from a measured beat, but from the various accents of prosody, of meaning, of devotion, and sentiment. The singer must be informed by the spirit of the texts, and his own sentiment must then inform the melody.

Such is a very brief summary of the theory; the facts are generally of a very different nature. If uncultivated voices and unsympathetic natures do but mock the fine ecstasy of the greatest modern composers; if they make that unrhythmic which is instinct

with the rhythm of a poetic soul, that hard and crude which vibrates with sentiment, that grandiose which is simple, that dramatic which is lyric (and *vice versa*)—in short, if they sing without knowing how, and disfigure utterly a noble musical creation: so, also, the harsh voice, untrained ear, uncultured heart, may easily succeed in parodying a chant which must essentially depend for its best beauty on the singer rather than the song. In modern music a knowledge of the text is not very essential to an interpretation of the melody; in plain chant it is uniquely and wholly so, for its rhythm and poetry and expression are the rhythm and poetry and expression by which a good reader presents the thought of a harmonious writer.

Again, our whole modern education in music; the universal prevalence of the modern as opposed to the mediæval modes; the tastes formed in us by this constant familiarity with but one kind of musical expression—this condition is surely unfavorable to a just appreciation of Gregorian chant. It is almost as though we should be called upon to relish the intricate and baffling tonalities of the Hindu, with his seventy-two modes and restrictive *ragas* regulating the succession of tones in a melody; or of the Persian, with his subdivision of the semitone into the limma and comma of Pythagoras; or of the Chinese, with his marvelously antique musical system founded on the celestial symbolism of numbers. And so the strange passes for the uncouth, and the unintelligible for the unscientific. Plain chant is, however, neither barbarous nor inartistic—it just happens to be mediæval and obtrusively scientific. What the future of chant will be in America—outside of the question of the *accentus* of the sacred ministers at the altar, a question which is definitely settled by enduring rubrics—we shall scarce venture to surmise. Our own land has not the centuried traditions which would serve so well as a foundation for a grand mediæval cathedral of song.

The regulation next praises the Palestrinesque style. A proper rendition of such a style must pre-suppose a good technical training in it. It can be executed by any good choir only in the same sense that Chopin can be played by any good pianist. Just as a proper interpretation of the music of Chopin requires, however, a distinct technical and æsthetic training for that one style of composition, so a good execution of Palestrina's masterpieces will require a knowledge of that traditional method of rendition which no mere study of a manuscript can furnish. A taste for the *a capella* style of the sixteenth century will scarce be a plant of quick growth here. The ecclesiastical modes used by that school will sound strange to ears accustomed to only the two modern scales, major and minor; and the gravity of progression and

formal style of counterpoint—pleasant as a change from the vivacity and freedom of modern melody and harmony—may easily pall on the taste, despite all the delicate surprises of chords and quaint progression of the parts and fine shadings of expression. Great praise is due to the Society of St. Cecilia for the cultivation and exposition of this style in America, as in Europe, and for the large repertory it has furnished to choir-masters. By voice and pen alike it has ably preached the excellences of both the style of Palestrina and his school and the present-day approach to it—we say approach, as the modern composers generally prefer, for obvious reasons, to follow his style in the modern tonalities.

The regulation speaks next of “chromatic music.” The great compositions of the great masters, Italian and extra-Italian, are considered “worthy of divine worship.” To give anything like a full account of the discussions raised on this subject would require a separate article. Briefly, it may be said that the compositions of the so-called Viennese school—Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven—and of the modern Italian schools have attracted special obloquy. But they have had brilliant apologists and have apparently suffered but slightly in popular favor and in frequency of performance. Their length, frequent repetitions of words, un-liturgical commencements (*e.g.*, in the words *Gloria in excelsis Deo* and *Credo in unum Deum*, which the rubrics confine to the celebrant), their operatic or quasi-operatic divisions into solo, duet, trio, chorus, etc., their occasional omissions and transpositions of words, their dramatic tone-painting, their brilliant scale-passages and *bravura* runs, their sensuous beauty—all these peculiarities which so forcibly differentiate them from the elder polyphonic chants, have served as so many heads of discourse, chapters of denunciation, shining targets for the shafts of ridicule. The discussion has been rarely temperate, and, therefore, rarely just.

The facts may perhaps be fairly stated as follows: Speaking generally, the compositions under discussion aimed at a quasi-dramatic exposition of the texts. The lawfulness or propriety of such a proceeding may be a matter for discussion; but, to the present writer, it seems to have exceedingly weighty arguments, which we need not enter into here, in its favor. Again, occasional textual omissions occur in some—not by any means in all—of these compositions. It is indeed a matter to be regretted, but it hardly seems necessary to condemn a whole masterpiece for one or two flaws, provided that such flaws be removable. And it has been said that in the works of the great masters there are very few such flaws which a competent choir-master cannot remove by careful manipulation of the musical texture. Again, repetitions of words occur, sometimes frequently, sometimes only very rarely.

The principle that no repetitions should be allowed would exclude every composition except plain chant, for all the schools of sacred music have used repetition—indeed could scarce avoid its use in the artistic development of a musical inspiration. The question of propriety immediately arises, and must determine the limits of repetition. In this connection, Article X. is worthy of quotation: "To safeguard the respect due to the words of the Liturgy, and prevent the ceremony becoming too long, every piece in which words are found to be omitted, deprived of their meaning, or indiscreetly repeated, is forbidden." To repeat is not then forbidden—but discretion must be used by composers. The Regulation of 1884 reads: "All music is forbidden in which the words of the sacred text are omitted, even to the smallest extent, or transposed, cut up, too often repeated, or only intelligible with difficulty." The expressions "too often repeated" and "indiscreetly repeated" are general, and suppose the watchful judgment of the ordinary, or parish priest, to define the limits. With respect to another charge against these compositions, namely, that their division into solos, trios, etc., suggests the theatre and concert-hall, it might be said that while in certain of the poorer masses—those composed by men of mediocre fame—the very frequent use of such "numbers" might suggest a poor opera of a former vogue, the works of the masters are very far from such suggestiveness. They are rather similar to a finely conceived oratorio—religious and inspiring. But the expression, "concert-hall," possessing one meaning in European phraseology, approaches in our own land to the viler uses of the word "saloon" in recent prohibition literature. It seems meant to convey rather vituperation than conviction, a sneer rather than an argument. Without entering further into a discussion of the propriety of such occasional divisions of the musical texture, it suffices to know that after all the battles waged against it, the Church has for it a word, not of condemnation, but only of caution. "It is forbidden," says Article XI., "to break up into pieces, completely detached, the versicles which are necessarily interconnected." The Regulation of 1884 entered more into detail: "Solos, duetts, and trios are permitted, provided they have the character of sacred music, and are part of the consecutive whole of the composition." The divisions are therefore permitted, but they must not be "completely detached" when they respect versicles which are "necessarily interconnected." Concerning the length of the "Masses," it may be noted that the custom in European churches is to have the Solemn Mass much earlier than in America, so that the liturgical limit of noon gives a large scope to the composer.

Finally, with regard to the "theatrical" character of such music,

it may be said that "tastes differ," and judgments also. Some church-music is cast in that line, but not the works of the great composers. The theatrical style of the German seems heavy and sombre and funereal to the Italian; that of the Italian is not sufficiently vivacious for the Frenchman; just as an Italian critic assures us that the religious music which is best suited for the French, the Italians judge to be light and puerile; and on the other hand, that which is religious to the Italians will sometimes cause wonder, if not scandal, to the French. The vague discussion which thus goes on in matters of taste is brought down to a practical working plane by Article IX.: "All profane music, particularly if it savors of theatrical motives, variations, and reminiscences, is absolutely forbidden." "Profane" music is that which is not "sacred" music. Perhaps we may understand this distinction better by recalling to mind the prohibition in the Regulation of 1884: "All kinds of vocal music composed upon *theatrical or profane themes or selections, are expressly forbidden in church*, as well as music of too light or too sensuous a style, such as *gaballette* or *cavalette*, or recitations of a theatrical nature." To select profane themes for the sacred texts was the musical and liturgical sin freely committed in the days of Palestrina, and it deservedly met with a rebuke that imperilled all figured music in the churches. We do not recollect having heard any such used by the great composers. With regard to the *cavalette* style, our American ears would not tolerate it for a moment in the Church, and we can recollect but one good Mass in which there occurs a "theatrical recitative."

But, while the composition itself may not be theatrical in character, the choir, too often, alas! is very much so. It is a subject for special ordinances, and as it is a painful one, and not immediately concerned with our present purpose, we shall dismiss it with the remark that to it should be referred most of the present devotional discontent with sacred music and the general feeling that some reforms should be speedily undertaken.

The remaining articles in the first section of the regulation are as follows:

ARTICLE V.—As a polyphonic musical composition, however perfect it may be, may, through faulty execution, appear unsuitable, it ought to be replaced by the Gregorian chant in strictly liturgical functions every time one is not certain of a successful rendering.

ARTICLE VI.—Figured organ music ought generally to be in accord with the grave, harmonious and sustained character of that instrument: The instrumental accompaniment ought to decorously support and not drown the chant. In the preludes and in-

terludes the organ, as well as the other instruments, ought always to preserve the sacred character corresponding to the sentiment of the function.

ARTICLE VII.—In strictly liturgical functions one ought to use the language proper to the rite, and the selected pieces ought to be taken from the Sacred Scriptures, from the Breviary or hymns and prayers approved by the Church.

ARTICLE VIII.—In any other ceremony one may use the vulgar tongue, selecting the words of devout and approved compositions.

ARTICLE XII.—It is forbidden to improvise fantasias upon the organ by any one who is not capable of doing it in a suitable manner—that is, in a way comformable not only to the rules of art but also calculated to inspire piety and recollectedness among the faithful.

Article V. has, unfortunately, no application to *our* needs. With us it would be still more difficult to render a plain chant Mass well than almost any figured chant. But a suggestion might be made, *apropos* of this, that wherever and whenever a choir is unable to produce properly a “grand” Mass it should respect the fame of the composer, the real merits of his work, the feelings of the congregation, and especially the liturgical proprieties, by contenting itself with a simpler composition.

Article VI., like Article XII., explains itself—would that many an organist might as clearly explain himself!

The provisions in Articles VII. and VIII. have respect to the liturgical use of the Latin tongue. Concerning the services we have generally here, the limits for the exclusive use of Latin are the High Mass, Vespers and Benediction (as soon as the *Tantum Ergo* has been commenced).

To understand the significance of the second section of the *Regolamento* it will be necessary to recall the older provisions abrogated by it. It seems a great pity that the circumstances of the dioceses in Italy did not permit these elder rules to continue. For many of the dioceses in this country they would seem to offer an excellent, and especially a very feasible, means for reforming abuses in sacred music. For this double reason they are here given (Artt. XV.–XXII.), followed by the recent abrogation of them.

Articles XV. and XVI. relate to the choice of books, etc., in which matter full liberty is left to the ordinaries, apart from the recommendations of the Sacred Congregation.

ARTICLE XVII.—Besides the published repertory of sacred music, the use is also permitted of manuscript music, such as is preserved in various churches, chapels and other ecclesiastical institutions, provided the choice is made by a special commission, under the title of St. Cecilia, which shall be founded in every

diocese, having at its head the diocesan inspector of sacred music, under the immediate control of the ordinaries.

ARTICLE XVIII.—The performance of pieces only, published or unpublished, will be allowed in church which are catalogued in the *Diocesan Index of Repertories* and which bear the countersign, stamp and *visa* of the *Commission of St. Cecilia* and of its inspector-president, who, in union with the Commission and always under the immediate jurisdiction of the Ordinary, without prejudice to the authority of local superiors, may even supervise the performance on the spot, request to inspect the music already or about to be performed and examine into the matter of their compliance with the regulations and with the papers authenticated by the countersign, stamp and *visa*. He may also report to the ordinary and obtain the application of energetic measures against those who transgress.

ARTICLE XIX.—Organists and choir-masters will devote all their efforts and their talent to the best possible execution of the music catalogued in that repertory. They may also employ their science to the enriching it with new compositions, provided these are in conformity with the aforesaid regulations, which are binding on every one. Even the members of the commission itself shall be subject to the reciprocal revision of their works.

ARTICLE XX.—To all missionary rectors and parish priests is entrusted the execution of the repertory in the *Diocesan Index*, compiled by the Commission of St. Cecilia and approved by the Ordinary, under pain of reprimand in case of transgression. This *Repertory Index* may afterwards have new compositions added to it.

ARTICLE XXI.—The said commissions shall be composed of ecclesiastics and of laymen, experts in music, and animated by a profoundly Catholic spirit. The nomination and appointment of all the members belong of right to the Ordinaries of dioceses.

FOR THE FUTURE IMPROVEMENT OF SACRED MUSIC SCHOOLS.

ARTICLE XXII.—To prepare a better future for sacred music in Italy, it is desirable that the ordinaries should be able to found schools for teaching figured music on the most perfect and authorized methods, or to improve those already existing in their sacred institutions, especially in the seminaries. To this end it would be advisable to open special schools for sacred music in the principal centres of the peninsula in order to train up good singers, organists and choir-masters, as has already been done in Milan.

These regulations contemplated the establishment in every diocese of a musical committee, consisting of ecclesiastics and laymen, "experts in music and animated by a profoundly Catholic

spirit," who should be appointed by the ordinary. This body of lay and clerical experts was to compile for its diocese an *Index of Repertories*. This repertory should be exclusive, so that no piece of music, published or unpublished, could be performed in church which should not meet its sanction. A diocesan musical inspector should be vested with the large powers of inspection indicated in Article XVIII. Energetic measures should be taken by the Ordinary against transgressors of the regulations. Again, bishops were counselled to found and improve special schools for the study of ecclesiastical music, and such study should be especially cultivated in the diocesan seminaries.

This scheme was evidently meant as a constant provision for reducing all of the *Regolamento* to practical measures. Although it failed signally, as the portion we are about to quote from the recent *Regolamento* shows, it might prove feasible in our own land, blessed with greater abundance of financial help, and quite free from fixed traditions in musical taste. But the repertory should be elastic enough to cover all needs, those of isolated and poorer communities as well as those of flourishing parishes; and the principal stress should, it seems to us, be laid rather on an edifying and capable execution of sacred music than on a specific determination of what that music should be in its style of composition. It has been our aim in this paper, as indeed it is plainly the aim of the *Regolamento*, to avoid æsthetic considerations, and to limit the reform movement to lines laid down by the rubrics and by the most common appreciation of the eternal fitness of things. Common sense is to be cultivated rather than scholastic tastes. It is not the character of the music performed so much as the frivolous vanities and irreverent vexations of organist and singers, generally more vain and vexatious as they are more incompetent, that should invite constant reproof. It is the heart service, and not the lip service, that God is pleased with. Whether it be Palestrina, or Haydn, or Cherubini, or Aldega, or the Mustafas and Capoccis of to-day, provided they write Masses within the lines of liturgical directions and a large sense of propriety, their music is not unfit for divine service amongst the various peoples by whom these various styles are respectively admired. It was a favorite thing amongst the lovers of the antique music to fling at Haydn's church compositions the sneer of Mendelssohn, that it was "scandalously gay." But tastes differ. What Mendelssohn thought gay even to scandal, the ordinary taste of our people considers classically dignified; while to the Italians it approaches the funereal. Hear one of them on this subject: "In the music of Mozart, *ex. gr.*, Haydn, Beethoven, we do not deny the merit of art, although many of their compositions are of such a character as very often to fatigue Italians, and, as it

were, invite to sleep!" He is speaking of the church music of these masters. Taste is, then, a matter of such universal variety, and of such immemorial privilege, that there is not a language in which its proverb does not exist—"every man to his taste." Men speak different tongues, but God hears one language; they praise Him in diverse music, but He hears one harmony. The lover of one style of church music shall fruitlessly dream of removing discordant schools. May he not console himself with the gracious words of Lowell?

"My dream is shattered; yet who knows
But in that heaven so near,
These discords find harmonious close
In God's atoning ear!"

The second part of the *Regolamento*, abrogating the elder specific directions which we have just been considering, is as follows:

"INSTRUCTIONS TO PROMOTE THE STUDY OF SACRED MUSIC
AND REFORM ABUSES.

"I.—Since sacred music forms part of the Liturgy, bishops are recommended to be specially careful of it, and to make it the subject of ordinances, particularly in diocesan and provincial synods, always in conformity with the present regulations. The co-operation of the laity is permitted, but under the supervision of the bishops. It is forbidden to form committees and hold congresses without the express consent of ecclesiastical authority, which, for the diocese, is the bishop, and for the province the metropolitan, with his suffragans. It is also forbidden to publish periodicals dealing with church music without the *imprimatur* of the ordinary. All discussion of the articles of the present regulations is absolutely interdicted. As to what concerns sacred music, discussion is permissible provided the laws of charity are observed, and that no one constitutes himself master and judge of others.

"II.—Bishops should impose upon clerics the obligation of studying plain chant, particularly as it is found in books approved by the Holy See. As to other kinds of music and the study of the organ, it will not be obligatory, so as not to distract them from the more serious studies to which they should apply themselves: but if there should be found among them those who are already versed in this kind of study, or who have particular aptitudes for it, they may be permitted to perfect themselves therein.

"III.—Let the bishops exercise supervision over parish priests and rectors of churches, so that they may not permit music contrary to the instructions of the present regulations, having recourse, if need be, to canonical penalties against delinquents.

"IV.—The publication of the present regulations, and the communication thereof made to the bishops of Italy, abrogates all previous regulations on the same subject."

We have presented the complete *Regolamento*, as approved in all its parts by the Holy Father, and by him ordered to be published. The word is to be final. All discussion of the regulations is forbidden; and all publications and "congresses," which are the fruitful parents of controversy, are to be regarded with the jealous and vigilant supervision of ecclesiastical authority.

Comment on this second section of the *Regolamento* is hardly needed. But we shall content ourselves with one of its directions as a concluding thought: "As to what concerns sacred music, discussion is permissible provided the laws of charity are observed, and provided that no one constitutes himself master and judge of others." This declaration looks to charity and peace, but is, as it cannot help being, reminiscent of discord and strife. Why the soothing subject of music should have been, like the soil in which the Dragon-teeth were sown, pregnant of a crop of warring giants, can perhaps be explained only by the fact that musicians are an "irritable tribe," like the *irritabile genus vatium* of Horace. It seems a very harsh implication which is contained in the remark of the Regulation that *no one should constitute himself master and judge of others*. But the Regulation desires to be a final one, and asserts finally that the supreme censorship of sacred music is vested, not in any sacred musical school, or any scholar, but alone in the Church—that Church which, throughout the long ages, has so patiently and so tenderly acted out the golden words of one of her greatest Doctors: "IN NECESSARIIS UNITAS: IN DUBIIS LIBERTAS: IN OMNIBUS CARITAS."

H. T. HENRY.

ST. CHARLES SEMINARY, OVERBROOK.

THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATION.

THE subject which we undertake to treat in this article is of the highest importance, whether it be regarded from the theological and canonical point of view or from that of international law. Both in its historical aspects and in its actual bearings it is full of an interest which we by no means underrate. We realize that delicate questions are involved, and, accordingly, we shall handle them with the care which they demand. Confining ourselves strictly to the scientific treatment of our subject, we shall establish principles and deduce conclusions. With politics we have nothing to do.

There are two official documents bearing on this matter which must be constantly kept in view. The first is the famous Response of Pius VI. concerning Nunciatures (Nov. 14, 1789). Cardinal Garampi and Francesco Antonio Zaccaria prepared the materials, while the work of putting them into proper shape devolved upon Cardinal Campanelli and the consistorial advocate Smith. The other document is the letter written April 15, 1885, by Cardinal Jacobini to the Nuncio at Madrid, Cardinal Rampolla. There are, moreover, various sources of information upon which we shall draw according as we present different aspects of the subject. Such, for the theologico-canonical treatment, are the principal Commentators on the Decretals¹ and certain modern writers.² As affected by international law our subject is handled, though not completely, in "La papauté en droit internationale," by Imbart Latour, while its historico-juridical aspect is discussed by Pierre de Marca³ and by Audisio.⁴ The latter claims that his work sets forth whatever is solid and useful in the Response of Pius VI., and contains, moreover, a critical review of De Marca's book. Finally, we shall not omit an examination of the opposite position as represented by Marco Antonio De Dominis, Richer, Febronius, Eybel, and, on somewhat different grounds, by Bluntschli, Geffcken, and Wyss. Those of our readers who may desire a more detailed bibliography will find it in the large collection of Roskovany.⁵ As it is our intention to write, not a treatise but an article, we shall

¹ De Officio Legati, Lib. I., tit. 30.

² Zaccaria, *Antifebronius Vindictus*, Diss. 6; Roskovany, *De Primatu Romani Pontificis Ejusque Juribus*, par. 106; Bouix, *De Curia Romana*, part 4, s. 1.

³ *De Concordia Sacerdotii et imperii* lib. 5.

⁴ *Idea storica e razionale della diplomazia ecclesiastica*.

⁵ *Romanus Pontifex tanquam Primas Ecclesie et Princeps Civilis*.

touch only the main points of our subject, dealing first with delegations in general and then with the American delegation.

I.—LEGATIONS IN GENERAL.

Every sovereign power is bound to preserve order within its borders and to maintain peaceful relations abroad. Similarly, there devolves upon the spiritual supremacy the two-fold duty of upholding discipline in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and of so managing its relations with civil authority as to insure the accord of Church and State. In the performance of this duty the Sovereign Pontiff, ruling the Church from its centre, is aided by representatives of his person and authority who are in a measure the eyes with which he sees, the mind with which he thinks, and the tongue wherewith he speaks. To these he intrusts, at times, a particular mission and at other times a general mission. In some cases their charge is temporary, in others it is permanent.

Various names have been given in the course of centuries to such representatives of the Holy See. Thus, they have been called *apocrisarii* or *responsales*, because they communicate the decisions and decrees (*ἀποκρισις*, *responsum*) of the Pontiff; *vicarii*, inasmuch as they take his place; *legati*, *delegati*, as acting in his name; *missi*, *nuntii*, *internuntii*, that is, his envoys or messengers. From these titles are derived such combinations as "Internuncio Extraordinary and Apostolic Delegate," "Apostolic Internuncio and Extraordinary Envoy," and the like. We need not at present enter into details of this nature. Suffice it to say that such appellations are not purely ecclesiastical in their origin; they are borrowed rather from the administrative language of imperial Rome, in which analogous offices were established and similar functions exercised. A word, however, may be added concerning the qualification "Apostolic." This term is always reserved for the Roman See, whose incumbent is styled *Dominus Apostolicus*, not only because Rome is the centre of jurisdiction but also because it is the living source whence the light, the strength, and the Christ-kindled fire of the Apostolate must radiate to all the ends of the earth.

Legates, nuncios, and envoys are occupied in what is called "ecclesiastical diplomacy." And in this connection we may remark that *diplomacy* is derived from the Greek *δίπλωμα*, which signifies *duplex* or double, and, consequently, something twice written. The term was applied to official and public documents of which the original was retained. The scribe who drew up the copy was known, according to Ducange's account, as *diplomatarius* or *uplicator*. Hence "diplomatist" in the beginning was used to designate a copyist or a custodian of copies. Later on, as the

form of such documents varied with the course of time, the same title was given to the person who showed his ability to understand and interpret them with the help of learning and critical acumen. Finally, at a more recent epoch, "diplomacy" came to be used in a higher sense, being transferred from the mere study of official papers to the science and art of negotiations and treaties. "Strange vicissitudes of a word! The modest term which once denoted the art of tracing or deciphering public documents has taken its place in assemblages that represent the majesty, the rights, and the interests of nations. It is applied even to those who represent the dignity of the Sovereign Ruler of Christians, the discipline and the interests of the Universal Church."¹

Legations to Particular Churches.

The sending of apostolic delegates to particular churches results naturally from the constitution of the Church Catholic and from the prerogatives of the Holy See. The history of such delegations is in a certain sense the history of the Church. The opponents of the one have been the enemies of the other.

The Church, in the language of Holy Writ, is an edifice of which Christ is the corner-stone; a kingdom whereof Christ is King; a fold of which Christ is the Shepherd; a living organism, a moral body, having Christ for its Head. Now Christ appointed as His vicar the Apostle Peter, and through him the Roman Pontiff, Peter's successor. Peter it is, therefore, upon whom the edifice rests, and to whom are given the keys of the kingdom. It is Peter who must feed the lambs and sheep of the flock, and who must confirm his brethren.

By the institution therefore of Christ Himself, the successor of Peter possesses supreme authority over the whole Church. This fundamental principle of Catholicism, defined but lately in the Vatican Council, was solemnly recognized by the East and the West in the Council of Florence, and, before that, in the second Council of Lyons, in 1274. Nowhere was it proclaimed more frequently or more energetically than in the proud cities of Antioch and Constantinople and in the words of St. John Chrysostom. In a hundred texts of this illustrious Father we find the affirmation that Christ has invested Peter with jurisdiction over the entire Church—*τὴν ἐπίστασιν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκκλησίας ἐνεχείρισε.*

Peter's jurisdiction over the Universal Church is *plenary*, extending without restriction to everything that involves spiritual interests, to whatsoever can be bound or loosed in the kingdom established by Christ. It is a truly *episcopal* jurisdiction, implying

¹ Audisio, op. cit., c. I.

the power to feed, direct, and govern the flock. It is *ordinary*, that is, it is to be exercised not only under exceptional circumstances, but also in the regular course of ecclesiastical affairs. And it is *immediate*, affecting directly all the faithful without any need of reaching one class through another, so that to it each individual, no less than the collective body, is subject.

On the other hand, the Universal Church, far from excluding particular churches, supposes them and encloses them in her bosom. The Church of Rome is not the only church; she is the mother and mistress of churches. And these, though dependent upon the mother-church and though forming but portions of the Universal Church, are none the less real churches, possessing in themselves a complete spiritual life and differing greatly from mere religious associations. Likewise, the bishop of Rome is not the only bishop; he is the bishop of bishops. About him are his brethren, whose jurisdiction flows from his, and who are subordinate to him. Nevertheless, they are princes and pastors in the true sense of the word; not simply delegates or prefects appointed by the Pontiff, and not merely superiors of religious congregations.

In each diocese, therefore, there are two episcopal authorities, that of the universal bishop and that of the local bishop. These jurisdictions in no way conflict. On the contrary, they are bound together in perfect harmony. The first is supreme, but does not absorb the other; the second, though subordinate, is yet efficacious and has its proper field of action. It is this truth that St. Leo so nobly expresses in his third sermon on the anniversary of his elevation: "*De toto mundo unus Petrus eligitur qui et universarum gentium vocationi, et omnibus Apostolis cunctisque Ecclesiae patribus praeponatur; ut, quamvis in populo Dei multi sacerdotes multique pastores, omnes tamen proprie regat Petrus, quos principaliter regit et Christus.*"¹

Such, according to the Catholic idea, is the constitution of the Church. The Church of God is not only a school for the teaching of truth; it is, moreover, a perfect society. It is neither a republic nor a confederation; and if it can be called a monarchy, it is certainly far different from all other monarchies. It is a government without earthly parallel. It is, so to speak, a family in which the eldest son has been charged by the father with the general control of the household, while the management of certain details is committed to his younger brothers. Fraternity and authority which, in other systems, are separate, interlace in the government of the Church and present the most admirable union of vigor and gentleness; the one proceeding from the supreme power, the other resulting from a true fraternity which involves a certain equality.

¹ Migne, Pat. Lat., liv., 149, 150.

Now he who has been divinely intrusted with the permanent office of feeding, guiding and ruling, must of necessity have the right and the obligation of performing through others such duties as he cannot personally discharge. Not only must he intervene when the flock is already poisoned or perishing, when faith has been corrupted, and discipline thrown to the winds; he must ever be on the alert with watchful eye and outstretched hand, to direct by active measures every portion of the Church. But the eye and the arm of the Pontiff are his legates. Through them it is that he exercises sovereign control in far-lying regions of the globe. Says Innocent II. in his letter of October 2, 1137, appointing as his legate Adalberon, Archbishop of Treves: "Nec tantum vicinis verum etiam longe positis, ex injuncto nobis a Deo Apostolatus officio existimus debitores, utpote quibus Beati Petri vincula commissa, et omnium ecclesiarum quæ per mundi climata sitæ sunt, sollicitudo incumbit; quatenus ea quæ per locorum distantiam vel causarum multiplicitatem, per nostram præsentiam terminare non possumus, hæc eadem per Apostolicæ Sedis vicarios, auctore Domino, exequamur."¹

There is one point in this matter which must be emphasized. The legates represent the person of the Sovereign Pontiff. They are sent to exercise his authority so far as it is communicated to them. They are not sent to lay hold upon the authority of bishops nor to lessen it. On the contrary, they are bound to sustain and defend episcopal power. Hence it is further to be remarked that their position is altogether different from that of secular ambassadors. The latter have no authority over the country to which they are sent. They are foreigners, just as the government which commissions them is foreign. But pontifical legates are not aliens. Wherever they are sent, they are on the territory of their sovereign, in whose name they act not merely by declaring his wishes and safeguarding his interests, but also by putting his decrees into execution. In a word they are more like the *legati provinciales* of imperial Rome, and the *missi dominici* of Charlemagne, than like ambassadors in the usual sense of the term.

The right of delegation being thus implied in the Primacy of the Pope, it is clear that any denial or restriction of the Primacy must challenge or limit that right. Say with Protestants and schismatics that the Pope has no authority over particular dioceses—that at most he enjoys but a primacy of honor: then, evidently, there can be no question of pontifical legates invested with jurisdiction. Declare with Richer, Febronius, De Dominis, Eybel and the members of the Congress of Ems, that the Pope has no ordinary and immediate jurisdiction in each diocese; then it is absurd to talk about *permanent* delegates. In fact, the Archbishop of Cologne, imbued with such false notions, wrote to Pius

¹ Migne, P. L., clxxix., 333.

VI., April 2, 1787. that he had fulfilled to the letter all his duties as a pastor in regard to the churches of which he had charge; and hence inferred, first, that the Pope was not justified in extending to those churches the extraordinary rights of the Primacy; secondly, that if the Pope had no right to send legates, the Archbishop was in no way obliged to receive them and permit the exercise of their powers to the detriment of his own ordinary authority over the flock divinely entrusted to his watchful care.¹ And if, finally, in the name of a narrow particularism, it be said, with the Gallicans, that the Pope is bound by the customs and the so-called *liberties* of nations, there can obviously be no question of legates, except with the permission of secular powers. Thus we read in the memoirs of the French clergy: "The Popes cannot send to France legates *a latere* unless at the request or with the consent of the king. Such legates cannot use their faculties until they have promised the king in writing and given their oath, that they will make only such use of these powers as will meet with the royal approbation."²

The institution of delegations is so intimately bound to the Primacy, flows from it so naturally, is so necessary to the life of the Church, that it has existed since the first centuries of Christianity under various names and forms. Leaving aside for the present the *Apocrisarii* and the *Responsales*, to whom we shall allude further on, let us name the vicars of Thessalonica, in Illyria; of Arles and Vienne, in Gaul; of Seville, in Spain; of Mayence, in Germany; of Canterbury, in England. The vicariate of Illyria must have dated from a very early period, since it is spoken of in the beginning of the fifth century as an ancient and solid institution. Innocent I., delegating the office of vicar to Rufus, Bishop of Thessalonica, in the year 412, affirms that in so doing he but follows the example of his predecessors, "*Praedecessores nostros apostolicos imitati*."³ St. Boniface I., in a letter to Rufus, 422, exhorts him to execute with zeal the duties imposed on the vicars apostolic who have preceded him,⁴ and, in an address to the bishops of Thessaly, he deprecates "any attempt to modify what our predecessors have done and practised for so long," "*Nullus ea quae sunt a patribus gesta et per tantum temporum custodita temerare contendat*."⁵ In the same sense speaks St. Sixtus III., 431,⁶ and St. Leo, 444. "We appoint as our vicar," writes the latter, "our brother and co-bishop, Anastasius," following therein the example of those the memory of whom is in honor.⁷ The vicariate of Arles, for antiquity, dignity and even extent, was not inferior to that of Thessalonica. The acts of the Popes Hilarus and Symmachus in regard to it are still extant.⁸

¹ Pii VI., Resp., p. 173.

² Mémoires du clergé de France, vii., 14, 24.

³ Migne, P. L., xx., 516.

⁴ Migne, P. L., xx., 774.

⁵ Migne, P. L., xx., 778.

⁶ Migne, P. L., l., 610. ⁷ Migne, P. L., liv., 615. ⁸ Migne, P. L., lviii., 22-28; lxii., 66.

It was in the fifth century that Zeno, Bishop of Seville, was created vicar apostolic in Spain by Pope Simplicius.¹ In the following century one of his successors, Sallustius, received from Pope Hormisdas the same powers to be exercised in Portugal.² The mission confided to St. Boniface, of Germany, was, in the beginning, rather of a missionary character than a Vicariate Apostolic in the proper sense. However, he became Vicar Apostolic when made Archbishop of Cologne and afterwards of Mayence. It is well known that he became famous throughout all Germany as Vicar of the Holy See, reformed churches, established bishoprics, celebrated national and provincial synods. This goes to show that the attributes of vicars were very extensive. For instance, the Vicar of Thessalonica had the right to visit churches, examine and approve candidates for the episcopate, examine and consecrate metropolitans, convoke synods and transmit their acts to Rome, dispense metropolitans from residence, receive petitions addressed to the Holy See for immediate decision or transmission to the Pope, and, finally, even to judge major causes.

But the vicariates, like all things human subject to vicissitudes, gradually became weak and infrequent. From the ninth century vicars were replaced by primates or *legati nati*, so called in contradistinction to *legati a latere*, the former being occupants of some see and natives of the country where they were the representatives of the Sovereign Pontiff. The *legati nati* differ from the former vicars only in the name, the greater number and the less extended jurisdiction. We find them located at Lyons, Narbonne, Toledo, Mayence, Salzburg, Cologne, Treves, Prague. Many acts concerning them indicate plainly their character. Adrian IV., in a letter of October 7, 1157, names as his representative for the whole Teutonic Empire, Hillinus, Archbishop of Treves, to act as legate of the Holy See, "*ut ibi legationis officio apostolicæ sedis auctoritate fungatur.*" For this purpose he is given full powers, "*plenariam a nobis recipiens potestatem.*" Bishops are commanded to render obedience to the legate as to the Pope himself, "*eidem tanquam apostoli & sedis legato, et cui vices nostras in hac parte duximus indulgendas, jure legationis studeatis sicut nobis ipsis specialius et diligentius inter alios obedire.*"³ To the exercise of the powers of such legates we find two conditions often set: that they shall send annually to Rome messengers to bring back instructions, that every third year they shall visit in person the Sovereign Pontiff, "*ut dulcissimi fratres ad primogenitum fratrem.*" We might add a third condition, the abeyance of their powers in the presence of a *legatus a latere*.⁴ The unfitness of many of the *legati nati* in the darkest times of the Middle Ages, the jealousy of the ordi-

¹ Migne, P. L., lviii., 35.

² Migne, P. L., lxiii., 425.

³ Migne, P. L., clxxviii., 1438.

⁴ Migne, P. L., cxliii., 594.

naries of the land and the consequent dissensions frequently made very difficult the execution of their office. Hence the necessity forced on the Holy See to send abroad *legati a latere* taken from the Roman Curia. The history of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries is filled with the doings and sendings of those latter representatives, among whom may be cited as chief models, Peter Damian and Hildebrand, two wonderful men destined by Providence, the one to bring about the interior reformation of the hierarchy, the other to liberate the Church from the degradation and stain of slavery to kings and emperors.

Finally, "considering the interior dissensions caused by primates," the Popes as early as the fifteenth century found themselves obliged to withdraw from them the representation of the Holy See and to send to Germany, France, Spain, Portugal and other kingdoms nuncios foreign to the country and to all parties, prelates distinguished by ecclesiastical position and agreeable to the sovereigns. Thus came into being the nunciatures at Catholic courts and capitals."¹ We shall return to this new institution later on.

Now, take your stand on the summits of history, consider the long series of Pontifical Representatives, Vicars, Primates, Nuncios, do you not see that their institution is an essential and natural part of the mechanism of church government, that its result is most beneficial? The Pope is the head directing the mystical Body of Christ, the heart to which flows, from which ebbs, the life-giving blood, the central force that sends movement to all parts of the circumference. Legates are the nervous conductors stretching from the head to all the members, the channels through which moves the vital circulation, the human instruments by which the Popes have maintained unity in the Church—unity, that wonderful but difficult result considering the many passions of mankind. Through its legates the Holy See secures independence in relation with the civil power, preserves the distinction of the two powers, which is the main principle of civilization, creates, maintains, restores, and purifies the churches of each country, guides and directs to fruitful results the councils, as, for instance, Nicea and Trent. Looking at the matter from this height what are the defects inseparable from human action, the weaknesses, the incapacities, the cupidities, the treasons even? They are scarcely visible and noticeable; scarcely audible to the ear, low and faint across the stretch of centuries, come the cries and lamentations that deplorable abuses have forced from holy souls. Taking history all in all, we are compelled to bless the great Pontiffs, Gelasius, Innocent, Leo, Nicolas I., Gregory VII., Leo IX., Innocent III., Nicolas V., and others of later centuries who have in-

¹ Responsio super nunt, p. 258.

stituted and organized the representation of the See of Peter throughout the world.

Delegations Sent to Civil Powers.

From the divine constitution of the Church and from the prerogatives of the Apostolic See is derived the right which the popes possess of sending representatives to secular governments—a right which they have made use of from the earliest times and with the happiest results for Christian civilization.

The Church is not merely an association, a syndicate, or a body corporate; it is a juridical society, perfect, independent, supreme. This is a principle of Catholicism on which Leo XIII. has repeatedly insisted, as, for instance, in the Encyclical *Immortale Dei*: “Haec societas est genere et jure perfecta, cum adjuncta ad incolumitatem actionemque suam necessaria, voluntate beneficioque conditoris sui, omnia in se et per se ipsa possideat.” Consequently, the Pope, as head of the Church, is a sovereign, because sovereignty consists in free, supreme, and independent authority.

Such being its nature, the Church is distinct from civil society as regards its character, its purpose, and the means whereby this is attained. Confusion of the two societies is impossible. This fundamental principle, the very basis of Christian freedom, was set forth as clearly and as firmly by the great bishops of the fourth century and by the doctors of the middle ages as it is today by Leo XIII. It is essentially Catholic.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that distinction is not isolation. Though not identified, civil government and ecclesiastical government are, in certain respects, necessarily bound together. They do not stand to each other as nations whose borders are the same or whose commercial interests are common. The relations of Church and State are far more intimate. They are as two societies composed of the same members, as two authorities ruling, each in its proper sphere, the same subjects. For the individual who, as a man, is a citizen, is, as a Christian, a child of the Church. Whence it follows that the two powers cannot ignore each other's existence, nor pretend to walk their several ways without heed for their mutual interests. A measure adopted by civil authority for the temporal welfare of the citizen may involve his spiritual harm; and, conversely, an action of ecclesiastical power intended to promote the spiritual interests of the faithful may be injurious from the temporal point of view. An understanding of some sort must, therefore, be arrived at between the two dominations.

To give these relations their concrete form, three different means

have been employed. There is, first of all, the *alliance* or union whereby Church and State, in order to attain their respective objects with greater sureness and facility, uphold each other with the mutual support of their authority and by their concerted action. In a second sort of *régime*, which may be styled that of *parity*, the secular power observes neutrality in regard to various religious organizations, to each and all of which it guarantees equality and protection. Then in the third place, there is the system of *liberty, universal tolerance*, indifference or separation, according to which, the State neither favors exclusively any denomination nor proscribes any form of religion, but professes to recognize and even to safeguard, entire liberty of conscience and of worship. It is on this principle that constitutional law accords to all religious bodies the rights of organization and of self-government. These are, in the main, the bases of agreement between the civil and the ecclesiastical power. Others might easily be devised; but, be their particular terms what they may, some relations of the sort must exist.

Now, according to the law of nations, both natural and positive, every sovereign power is entitled to representation abroad, or, in other words, has a right to see that its interests are looked after by its envoys. Consequently, and with much greater reason, the Pope has a right to send his legates to secular governments; for the relations existing between Church and State are more intimate and essential than those in which nation and nation are concerned; the interests at stake are of more vital importance; the authority of the Pontiff is higher and more sacred.

This papal right does not assume the union of Church and State, nor the existence of special concordats, nor even the profession of Catholic belief by the civil authorities or by a majority of their subjects. It is founded in the very nature of things. To set it aside, one must deny that the Church is an independent juridical society, or question the sovereignty of its head, or refuse to recognize the possibility of relations between Church and State. Let us see what the logical consequences are. In the first case, it would follow that the Church is a simple association in subjection to the civil power, that there is no distinction between the two powers, and that the Protestant principle is correct—*cujus regio illius et religio*.¹ Again, to admit that the Pope is the head of a perfect society and at the same time to deny his sovereignty, is a contradiction in terms. It will be objected, of course, that according to the generally accepted view, a sovereign must have territory, and that the Pope has none. This condition, we reply, might hold good for temporal and circumscribed power; it cannot affect a government that is spiritual and universal. As a matter of fact, however, the possession of territory is not essential even to secular

¹ Ant. Schmidt, *Thesaurus*, III., 551 (Franck).

rule. Mr. Hall, in his "Treatise on International Law,"¹ has shown that those who make such possession a requisite for sovereignty, are guided by medieval traditions rather than by the established principles of modern law. In the feudal system power and land ownership were one, and this notion made its way into international law; but it is by no means equivalent to a fixed and necessary principle. Quite recently, in the Plessis-Bellière case, Melcot, the Attorney-General, admitted without the least hesitation that the Pope is an independent ruler, and proved on Puffendorf's authority, that the doctrine in vogue requiring as essentials for the State an agglomeration of individuals and a territory, is far too narrow: the body politic to which we give the name "State" results from a union of wills and of forces, which forms the most powerful sort of society.

Lastly, the refusal to acknowledge relations between Church and State shows a total misconception of the matter and a blindness to the reality of facts. How Bluntschli could have asserted that the spiritual supremacy of the Pope has no more to do with the State than the pretensions of a great philosopher who should set himself up as the highest authority in the scientific world, is beyond our comprehension. For the same author concedes that the ecclesiastical influence of the Papacy upon the relations of the Roman Church with Sovereign States—relations analogous to those that subsist between nations—suffices to invest the envoys of the Holy See with the dignity of ambassadors. Hence Prussia and Russia, after breaking off their relations with Rome, were obliged to resume them. Even England, though always opposed to diplomatic intercourse with the Holy See, has, on various occasions, sent her agents to negotiate with Leo XIII.

The right, therefore, of appointing representatives to secular governments, is inherent in the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and, as such, has always been maintained by the Popes. In connection, for instance, with the Belgian incident of 1880, Leo XIII. expressed himself in terms that are as remarkable as they are unambiguous. "*Cumque jus potestatemque habeat Pontifex Maximus Nuntios aut Legatos ad exteras gentes, nominatim catholici nominis, earumque principes mittendi, de violato hujusmodi jure cum iis quos penes est culpa, expostulamus; eoque magis quod ejus juris multo augustius est in Romano Pontifice principium, cum ab amplissima auctoritate primatus, quem ille divinitus obtinet in universam Ecclesiam proficiscatur.*"

This right, moreover, has always been acknowledged by the general consent of civilized nations. Evidently this consent did not establish the Pope's right, but it would have sufficed for creating that right had none such existed. And this consideration

¹ Oxford, 1890.

should be conclusive even for those who do not admit that the constitution of the Church is divine, for no one will deny that the acquiescence of all peoples is a source of international law. We insist then, if the Pope's legates are received by secular governments, if they have the rank of ambassadors and international agents, this is in virtue of a solidly established right and not merely in token of good-will, condescension, or respect for ancient traditions.

The Pope, without doubt, possessed, until lately, a temporal domain. *De jure* he possesses it always, and *de facto*, even, he holds a remnant of it in the few acres which the Vatican covers. But it is not this principality, either large or small, that has made the Pope a sovereign. It is not upon any strip of territory that are based, either exclusively or essentially, his international relations. He was a sovereign before he possessed a foot of the "Patrimony of St. Peter," and a sovereign he remains, though his dominions have been wrested from his sway. It is as head of the Church that he to-day receives kings and emperors, and that he welcomes the diplomatic representatives of foreign powers. Likewise, in commissioning his legates, he acts as Supreme Pontiff rather than as ruler of the papal domain. Bluntschli declares this emphatically: "It is as heads of the Church and not as masters of a State, as popes and not as kings, that the Pontiffs obtained the first place in the society of princes. It is in this quality that they sent legates, nuncios, and internuncios to the courts of the world, and that they negotiated concordats, the contents of which has nothing to do either with the patrimony of St. Peter or with the inhabitants of the States of the Church." At the beginning of this century the French Minister of the Interior wrote to the Duc de Richelieu: "The Pope himself, though he be regarded neither as a foreign sovereign nor as a temporal prince, is none the less, as head of the Church and as Sovereign Pontiff, an independent power."

The right to maintain international relations belongs, as a rule, to sovereign power, and therefore the management of relations between Church and State pertains chiefly to papal authority, and only in a subordinate and exceptional way to the episcopate of any country. This much is clear from the words addressed by Cardinal Jacobini to the Nuncio Rampolla: "Convieni poi notare chè nello stesso articolo (in the *Siglo Futuro*) si afferma la preminenza del diritto dei Vescovi sopra quello del Nunzio intorno alle questioni riguardanti le relazioni tra la chiesa e lo Stato, senza però avvertire chè questioni siffatte, appunto perchè hanno rapporto cogli interessi di tutto il cattolicesimo e dei cattolici di un dato stato, nel quale sono comprese piu diocesi, appartengono in

particolare maniera al Rappresentante del sommo Pontefice; è l'azione relativa dei Vescovi, sia singolarmente presi, sia presi collettivamente in uno stato, deve essere sempre subordinata al capo Supremo della Chiesa ed in conseguenza a chi lo rappresenta."

The first representatives sent by the Holy See to civil powers were the *apocrisarii* or *responsales*. Whether this office can be traced back to the days of Constantine is doubtful. Hincmar's authority on this point is not decisive. The earliest documents which we have date from the time of the Council of Chalcedon. Aware of the dangers that threatened the Church, St. Leo resolved to send as his representative to the emperor a man "brought up by the Holy See and imbued with its spirit and doctrine." His choice fell upon Julian, Bishop of Cos in the Archipelago. There is yet extant what may be termed the brief of delegation—the 113th letter of St. Leo. We have also, in the 111th, addressed to the Emperor Marcian, the "letter of credentials," as we would say in modern parlance: "Illud quoque clementiæ vestræ benevolentiam peto, ut fratrem nostrum Julianum episcopum, in vestro, sicut facere dignamini habeatis affectu; cujus obsequiis præsentia meæ vobis imago reddatur. Nam et de fidei ejus sinceritate confidens, vicem ipsi meam contra temporis hæreticos delegavi; atque propter ecclesiarum pacisque custodiam, ut a comitatu vestro non abesset exegi; cujus suggestiones pro concordia catholicæ unitatis tanquam meas audire dignemini." In the 112th letter we find a recommendation addressed to the Empress Pulcheria.¹

Among those who later on held similar positions as delegated by the Holy See may be mentioned St. Gregory the Great. In his "Dialogues," lib. iii., c. 36, he tells us: "Dum jussione Pontificis mei, Constantinopolitanæ urbis palatio responsis ecclesiasticis observirem." Elevated to the papal throne, he placed the welfare of souls above all temporal considerations, and deigned to send a representative to the Emperor Phocas. The troubles growing out of the Monophysite heresy forced this apocrisarius to withdraw, but as soon as peace was restored Constantine Pogonatus petitioned Pope Leo II. to appoint another representative. "Hortamur vero vestram sanctissiman summitatem, ut quamprimum mittat designatum ab ea apocrisarium; ut is in regia urbe degat, et in emergentibus sive dogmaticis sive canonicis, ac prorsus in omnibus ecclesiasticis negotiis vestræ Sanctitatis exprimat ac gerat personam."

The office of Apocrisarius came to an end in the Orient during the eighth century on account of disturbances caused by the Iconoclasts. With the restoration of the western empire by Leo III.

¹ Migne, P. L., liv., 1019-1027.

came the establishment, at the new imperial court, of positions and titles analogous to those at Constantinople. In these circles the envoys of Rome were treated with the honor befitting their station. But the weakening and division of the empire under the unworthy successors of Charlemagne and the discords which ensued made it both useless and impossible to have permanent apostolic legates at the court of the Franks. Causes more deplorable still prevented the maintenance of delegations at the German imperial courts. From time to time, however, the Pope sent his representatives, entrusted with a temporary mission, not only to Christian potentates but also to infidel rulers. At length, as the modern era dawned and great national unities were solidified in definite form, the papal *apocrisarii* reappeared under the title of *nuncios*.

The latter, it must be noted, like their predecessors, are not simply diplomatic envoys; they are invested, moreover, with ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This is evident, as regards the Apocrisarii, from the documents which have already been cited. Nor is it less clear in the case of the nuncios, for, to omit other quotations, we find that Cardinal Jacobini, after stating that the nuncios have no other authority than that which is communicated to them, says in his letter: "E però vero chè il sommo pontefice dà ai suoi nunzii una missione puramente diplomatica senza veruna autorità sopra i pastori ed i fedeli esistenti negli stati presso i quali sono essi accreditati? Può ammettersi chè il Santo Padre mandi i suoi Nunzii come i governi civili mandano i loro ministri e rappresentanti? Dai relativi brevi ed istruzioni apparisce invece chè i nunzii apostolici hanno una missione non puramente diplomatica, ma autoritativa riguardo ai fedeli ed alle cose religiose." It would seem that the powers conferred on papal nuncios awaken suspicions in certain quarters and are regarded as a source of danger by some well-meaning people. But a moment's reflection will show that there is no need of such alarm. The scope of these powers is limited to spiritual matters, with which secular governments have nothing to do, and in which they disclaim all interference.

After what we have said in the foregoing, we need not dwell long on the excellent results which have been obtained by the appointing of legates to secular governments. By this means more than by any other the Popes have christianized nations. As Audisio very happily says: "That, in regard to purity of morals, equity of law, moderation of government, in regard to all those virtues which bind man to his fellow-men and raise him up to God, Christian civilization is the exact opposite of paganism, is a truth which no one will question. But who will dare say that this civilization was formed by the sword of pagan or half-pagan emperors? And if it is due to the ceaseless, strenuous efforts of the

Christian priesthood, how could it have asserted itself and mounted to the very throne of the empire, in order to transform it, without bringing it into close and continuous contact with the priesthood and with the Pontiff, who rules in religion as the emperor rules in the state? And how could the Pontiff, residing personally in Rome, have transferred his presence, so to speak, to Constantinople and have faced the thousand difficulties that arise unexpectedly in a new order of things, except through the action of his representative? Hampered as it was and imperfectly understood by the emperors, this action was, nevertheless, in perfect conformity with the essentials of Christian society, which calls for the efficacious co-operation of the two supreme social authorities, the Church and the state."¹

It is by their legates also that the Popes have lent such a powerful defence to Christian civilization in forming those leagues that withstood the onset of the Mussulman. It is through their legates that, after laboring so long to bring about peace between Christian nations, the Popes prepared the way for a world-wide human society. "The Catholicity of the Church," says Audisio, "and her universal diplomacy necessarily begot the idea of fraternity in the whole race and taught the nations to agree upon their common interest through the mediation of ambassadors."² Nor need we repeat that, by means of their legates, the Popes have over and over again shielded the rights of the people from the excesses of tyranny, social purity from the debauch of worthless princes and international peace from the ruptures that heedless ambition desired and provoked. Bygone instances need not here be cited. It will be sufficient to recall the services rendered by the diplomacy of Leo XIII. to Germany, France and Spain. In the midst of passion and political strife the action of the Pope has everywhere been put forward in the interests of peace.

II.—THE AMERICAN DELEGATION.

Superficial minds are sometimes astonished at the importance given by popes to the maintenance and development of Apostolic delegations. Their solicitude on this point has been often laid to ambition, to greed for mastery, and in our days it is taxed as vanity or anxiety to find some compensation for the loss of the temporal power. How far from the truth are such appreciations! If the popes attach so much importance to delegations, the real reason is that the institution is the best means to assure the prosperity of the Christian peoples, the most emphatic expression of the two fundamental principles, that the Church is a perfect society and that in the Church the Sovereign Pontiff has full, ordi-

¹ *Oz. cit.*, c. 14.

² *Ibid.*, c. 15.

nary, and immediate jurisdiction. Delegations, therefore, are the plain showing forth of the position held by the Papacy in the Church, of the position held by the Church in the world.

On these high considerations must we take our stand to account for the establishment of the Apostolic Delegation in the United States. It is due not only and mainly to accidental and transitory causes, it is the natural consequence of first principles and Catholic tradition. The Church of the United States has an existence of a hundred years; it has had a wonderful development, which perhaps has reached its climax as far as the hierarchy is concerned. It was to be expected that the Pope should wish to be present through his representative in the midst of the fourteen archbishops and sixty-nine bishops that now constitute the hierarchy of the Church in the United States. By that presence this young Church takes rank with her elder sisters of France, Austria, Spain, Belgium, and rises to the dignity of the earlier Churches of Gaul, Germany, Illyria. The reasons that actuated former popes to appoint representatives to Arles, Seville, Thessalonica operate to-day to induce Leo to send his representative to Washington. Distance from the centre, multiplicity of affairs, difficulty of correct information in spite of our present rapid communication, make necessary the presence of pontifical agents to-day as in past centuries.

The American Delegation is ecclesiastical and not diplomatic. The Holy Father has commissioned his representative to the Church of the United States with definite powers to be exercised in his name, powers which it is not our present business to detail. He has not commissioned him to the government of the United States. We believe he had no thought of so doing; we have yet to learn that any overture in this direction has been made or is even contemplated. Our peculiar political condition, public opinion among us, and various other elements to be taken into account, may be unfavorable to such a move. Abstracting from those, is there in the Constitution of the United States anything that would fundamentally oppose such a representation? We feel like answering negatively; we do not see why the Constitution should be said to oppose such a representation any more than it does liberty and equality of creeds, separation of Church and State. Papal legates are not sent to meddle in civil affairs, nor to give governments the right to meddle in ecclesiastical affairs. They are sent to prevent politico-religious conflicts, to maintain a mutual good understanding between the spiritual and the temporal, without sacrifice of or interference with the reciprocal independence of either. All serious thinkers acknowledge that the Church has in this country a great mission, a national mission as

to social questions, as to the assimilation of the foreign elements in our population. What should hinder an understanding with the Head of the Church on these and other like interests?

However, these are only our personal views. Let us pass on to the fruits expected by the Holy Father from the delegation he has established. Above all, a greater and stronger union of the American Church with the Holy See. Such a union will import into our Church more of the Christian life centred in Rome and by reaction will export the influence of this fresh and vigorous republic into the Universal Church. National churches are members of the great Catholic body, and the more they partake of the life of the Mother Church, the more they exercise action abroad and contribute to the prosperity of the other members. See for instance what the Catholic world owes to the noble Church of Spain for its glorious galaxy of saintly and learned men, for its grand examples of Christian virtues and heroism in all the walks of life. Whoever scans attentively the course of events can see that this young Church of the United States is destined by Providence to a leading part in the future of the world. But it is equally clear that it is only by the strictest union with Rome that she can be prepared, trained and guided in the fulfilment of that glorious destiny.

A second result will be a more perfect unity within the American Church by virtue of the presence of the papal representative, greater concord and harmony of action and consequently greater force of expansion and resistance. For, as Pius VI. wrote to the Electors, the Church has nothing to fear from outside foes when the members are solidly bound to the head.

A third result will be the strengthening of episcopal authority by virtue of the enlightened support which each bishop will receive in the discharge of his delicate duties. The Council of the Vatican, while defining the prerogatives of the Holy See, was careful to add that the supreme power of the Pope, far from diminishing the authority of the Episcopate, consecrated and confirmed it; and the Council adopted as its own the beautiful words of St. Gregory the Great to Eulogius of Alexandria: "*Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tunc ego vere honoratus sum cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.*" Leo XIII. may be said to have taken special pains to realize this principle. One of the characteristics that history will attribute to his pontificate will be the support he has given to bishops. Everywhere and at all times he has vindicated the rights and the honor of the Episcopate. He has never ceased to inculcate respect and submission of the faithful and the clergy to their chief pastors, as is abundantly proved by his Encyclicals to the Bishops of Spain,

France, Italy and to the Archbishops of Paris and Tours. Such has ever been the tradition of the Holy See.

A fourth result will be the security of the sacerdotal body by the development of a spirit of justice and equity on the one hand, of respect and noble obedience on the other. A fifth result must surely be order in the Catholic army—increase of zeal and devotion to all good works. Finally, a sixth result will be peace and concord with the civil power. The spirit of the Holy See is not one of exaggeration and *intransigence*, but one of prudence, moderation, opportune concessions, respect for national institutions. Nothing is so dreaded by the Holy See as politico religious conflicts. Popes have sought always to prevent them by all just and laudable means; they have gone to the length of the greatest sacrifices, stopping short of dogmatic principles, to end dissensions with the governments.

Such are the benefits that may be expected from the apostolic delegation to the United States. But to secure them certain conditions are necessary, or rather certain duties are incumbent on the Catholics of the country. To speak only of two that we consider the most important, we name *honor* and *support*. Undoubtedly the first duty is to give due honor to the Pope's representative. Pope St. Boniface, writing to the Bishop of Thessaly about his vicar, says: "Be mindful of the respect you owe to the head."¹ St. Sixtus says to the prelates of Illyria: "It behooves you to respect and honor your chief, for the honor of the chief redounds to the sanctification of the members."² And in his letter to the bishops of the Synod of Thessalonica, the same Pope clearly lays down that the vicar apostolic among them is not intended to absorb all authority and honor; that he must cause no harm to the rights and honor of the Metropolitans; but, on the other hand, they must not deprive him of the honor of being their superior; they should honor him all the more that they themselves are honored by the Holy See.³

A second duty of Catholics is to give moral support and aid to the Papal delegate. St. Gregory II. claims this favor, ~~may~~ imposes this obligation on the bishops of Germany, to whom he commissions St. Boniface as his representative: "Ut contra quoslibet adversarios, quibus in Domino praevalētis, instantissime defendatis."⁴ This obligation, to which bishops bind themselves by oath on the day of their consecration, concerns priests also, and, in a certain measure, all the children of the Church. It is felony, it is high treason against the Papal sovereignty to create opposition to an apostolic delegate, falsify or travesty his acts and inten-

¹ Migne, P. L., xx., 778.

² P. L., l., 618.

³ P. L., l., 614.

⁴ Migne, P. L., lxxxix., 501.

tions, provoke against him suspicion and diffidence. "Omni laesisti Christianitatem . . . laesisti apostolos quorum est princeps Petrus," wrote the Council of Paris to the Duke of Brittany, and the expression is not too strong for disloyalty to the representative of the Holy See.¹

So far we have been occupied with principles and facts. In conclusion we beg leave to say a word of the persons whose honored names underlie the thoughts and words of this article; we mean His Holiness Leo XIII., and His Excellency the Most Rev. Francis Satolli.

Cicero, in a letter to his brother Quintus, says that Plato thought republics would be happy if the government were given to the learned and the wise, or at least to men whose chief pursuit in life was science and wisdom; the alliance of power and wisdom would safeguard society.²

This alliance of authority, learning, and wisdom you will find generally in the Roman Pontiffs; and surely it is pre-eminent in the wonderful man, philosopher and statesman, who now sits on the throne of Peter, and for seventeen years has governed the Catholic Church, restoring it to its place of honor among the nations.

At the end of the work we have so often cited, Audisio sums up the qualities required in the ecclesiastical diplomat. The first quality is knowledge of the public law of the Church and of Christian nations. Then he must know how to adapt himself to all governments; how to bless them and be blessed by them. Moreover, since the Church is above all earthly politics, he must understand that his special virtue is to be the faithful friend of the nation where he makes his home. As crown of all civil and moral virtues comes priestly piety. Thus fitted he may, in the words of St. Bernard, procure "*pacem regnis, quietem monasteriis, ecclesiis ordinem, clericis disciplinam, Deo populum acceptabilem, sectatorem bonorum operum.*" Theological and canonical science, understanding and love of the institutions and the people of the United States, sacerdotal piety—these are three qualities that no American will deny to the representative of Leo XIII. in Washington.

T. BOUQUILLON.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

¹ Hardouin, v., 19.

² Ille princeps ingenii et doctrinae Plato, tum demum fore beatas respublicas putavit, si aut docti aut sapientes homines eas regere coepissent; aut ii qui regerent omne suum studium in doctrina et sapientia collocarent. Hanc conjunctionem videlicet potestatis ac sapientiae saluti censuit civitatibus esse posse.

THE RELATIONS OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY.

THE growth of a science implies contact with other sciences. It obeys certain laws analogous to those which govern the development of organisms. As life requires the continual adjustment of internal relations and external relations, so is the vitality of a science maintained not only by the proper conception and solution of its own problems, but also by the adaptation of its work to that which is done in neighboring branches. This adaptation, in the main, is of a double character; each science acts upon those which form its environment, and in turn is affected by their influence. There is thus established, within a given sphere, a co-operation whereby the various sciences are mutually helpful, an interchange of good offices from which all derive profit.

Connections of this sort are effected in different ways, and are closer in some cases than in others. Lines of research which formally and in view of their special purposes diverge, may have their material object in common. The same substance, or the same set of phenomena, is often examined simultaneously by the physicist and by the chemist, while the same structures are of interest to the anatomist and to the physiologist. Under these circumstances, it is but natural that progress in one branch should affect the research that is carried on in others. Apart, however, from such a community of objects, there may exist among allied sciences a community of interests, inasmuch as results obtained in any particular investigation suggest new problems in quite a different order, and serve instrumentally for their solution. So it has happened that physiology, within the last fifty years, has made unprecedented advance by pressing physical methods into its service. Finally, those sciences which keep up no direct intercourse within their empirical limits, may meet on the higher plane of generalization. Starting from widely different points of view, and moving along separate paths of research, they may, in seeking a final interpretation, converge upon the same comprehensive principle. Hence the far-reaching importance of the law of the conservation of energy.

Experimental psychology, in less than half a century, has passed through all these phases of interaction, and still feels their influence. Its field is, to a great extent, identical with that of the elder introspective psychology. Its methods are constructed on data supplied partly by the latter science and partly by physiology.

Its results have compelled the notice of physiologists and psychologists alike. This would have happened if psychology had always been as thoroughly empirical as botany and geology. But by reason of its long and intimate relation with metaphysics it has, while taking its actual direction, drawn attention from higher quarters. Philosophy, of course, has interests at stake, and the philosophers have not been slow in telling us what these interests are, and how they might be advanced, retarded, or imperilled.

The new psychology, therefore, at the very beginning of its existence, is environed by manifold influences to which its activity must respond. One aspect of this correspondence we have already presented in showing what psychology owes to the natural sciences.¹ There remain now to be studied its claims to scientific recognition and its philosophical bearings, both speculative and practical.

As was shown in our former article, the leading feature of the modern science is the application of the experimental method, and it is with this that we are here occupied. When, on some future occasion, the aims, procedure and results of comparative psychology shall have been fully explained, its philosophical consideration will be in order. For the present, we have to inquire whether experimental methods come within the scope of psychology; whether they are bettered or vitiated by philosophical implications; and whether they may be used to advantage by the adherents of a certain philosophical system.

I.

To decide whether a particular science may consistently employ a particular method, is at first sight an easy matter. Knowing exactly the scope of the science and the problems with which it deals, we have only to see whether the solution of these is attained, or at least attainable, by the method in question. Given, therefore, a definite range for psychology, the use of experimental methods would seem to be justified, if they help us to understand more clearly the subjects which our science must handle, if they throw additional light on truths already established and open up a store of facts that were hitherto but vaguely known or entirely unknown. With these principles for our guidance and with a fair knowledge of what has actually been accomplished by experiment, we should find no difficulty in according the new method a place in the service of psychology. As a matter of fact, experimental methods have secured such a place, and the only way to dispute their right is to show that "psychology" has, in general acceptance, a meaning and a purpose which demand their exclusion.

¹ In the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW for July, 1894.

To do this, however, a proper acquaintance with the methods is necessary. So long as their nature is obscure, the wisest course is to suspend judgment. And if it finally appear that they are beyond comprehension, or that it would cost too much to render them intelligible, the whole question had better be adjourned. But to reach a definite conclusion, either positive or negative, one must understand the methods. Even to conclude with Prof. James¹ that Fechner's notions are "patient whimsies," one should be familiar with some portion of the "dreadful literature" in which they are expounded and discussed. That this literature is already extensive and is constantly growing, we need not here repeat. It is by no means "light reading"; it requires as much patience on the part of the student as it evinces on the part of the authors. But whoever makes his way through it will be able to state clearly what is required for understanding the science and its methods.

We read of late: "Really, to understand the new psychology, there is need of nothing more than physiology and physics." This is simple enough. Five pages farther: "*To begin to understand*² what all these methods mean, we have to take our stand in the formalism of Kant, or in the idealistic realism of Herbart, or in some go-between system . . . such as Wundt has devised." Now, no one will suspect that the criticism containing these passages was written from any such dangerous "stand." Our main difficulty is in bringing the two statements to something like consistency. If physiology and physics are alone sufficient to understand the new psychology, it does not seem probable that the understanding of its *methods* should oblige us to take such a plunge into metaphysics. The methods are surely an essential part of the science. Can this be mastered apart from them? Or are we to infer that Kantism, Herbartism, and Wundtism permeate physiology and physics? It is not for us to decide which of these questions should be affirmatively answered, but for the sake of those who may be similarly perplexed when comparing the alleged requisites, we suggest two others that harmonize better. The first is to study the methods in some reliable text-book, such as Wundt's "Grundzüge";³ the second, to spend a semester or so in a psychological laboratory. Physiology and physics will be found useful; mathematics will do no harm; and if the student, in addition, has a tolerable power of self-observation, he will make good prog-

¹ *Principles of Psychology*, London, 1890, i., p. 549.

² Italics ours.

³ *Grundzüge der Physiologischen Psychologie*, 4te Aufl. Leipzig, 1893. "Grundzüge" is sometimes translated "Sketch," but this English term is misleading when applied to a work of some 1300 pages in 8vo. See also Külpe, *Grundriss der Psychologie*, Leipzig, 1893.

ress without taking much thought of philosophic systems either past or present.

If, furthermore, he be gifted with ordinary intelligence, he will perceive that it is one thing to sketch the growth of psychology and another to prove that it is an exact science. Its exactness or inexactness depends upon the sort of methods which it employs, and which can be examined without the least allusion to the history of the science. Such history is none the less instructive, and our student may read it with profit. Should he do so, his ethical notions will probably forbid him to arbitrarily cut up an outline into "proofs," and to swell their number by others of his own fancying in order to display his critical acumen. Neither Weber nor Fechner ever followed these tactics, which, after all, are no help to an understanding of psycho-physical methods.

To mark off the limits of psychology is more difficult than one might suppose. Sylvester Maurus observes that "all the divisions made by wise men, though founded on the nature of things, have something arbitrary about them and might have been differently made."¹ He is speaking, not of divisions made to suit critics, but of the partition of knowledge, and in this sense his assertion is borne out by the history of scientific terminology. For though the names originally given to the sciences have for the most part survived, their meaning has, in many instances, been modified. Physiology is no longer the "science of nature," nor is zoology a "treatise on living things." The meaning of these terms has been restricted. On the other hand, geometry is something more than "land-measurement," just as chemistry has other purposes than the "study of juices," both sciences having widened their fields of investigation beyond the limits set by etymology. The literal derivation of its name may indicate in a general fashion the nature of a science; it is not always the safest criterion for determining the precise scope of that science. If it be found that "psychology," in the course of time, has either widened or narrowed its signification, and that the object of the science is variously defined, no mere appeal to etymology will put an end to these differences or correct these deviations.

Is *usage* more decisive? Arbitrary as the wise may be in making their divisions and in employing terms, the development of terminology as a whole is not altogether a matter of accidental variations. It is, in a larger sense, what progress in the use of words is for the individual mind. A child who is learning to speak, employs his few expressions to denote all sorts of persons and things;

¹ *Quaestiones Philosophicae*, l. i., q. 5. We do not see why this author or any other should be quoted at second hand—unless it be desirable to impose a double task on the reader.

his power of generalization outstrips the growth of his vocabulary. Later on, as he is taught the proper name for each particular object and action, he retains the more general terms but gives them narrower meanings. And, finally, he is enabled, by observation and experience, to apply words in their specific sense to an ever-increasing number of individual objects. For the child, then, there are alternating phases of contraction and expansion which must be passed through, before language can acquire in his mind its definite symbolical character.

Similarly, in the earlier stages of knowledge considered as a racial acquisition, its branches are comparatively few, and the name of each is comprehensive in proportion. But as investigation furnishes new data, division and classification become necessary, and, as a consequence, specialized names are required. The result is, in some cases, a new term, like "Histology," which is an offshoot of anatomy, or like "Calculus," a highly developed branch of mathematics. In other cases the parent-name is kept, and is qualified by an adjective which expresses the leading feature of the specialized science. Thus we get "Molecular Physics," "Organic Chemistry," "Dogmatic Theology," and "Moral Theology." Specialization at times imports a restriction of the subject matter, and at other times the treatment of the same matter by different methods. But whatever course terminology, in particular instances, may follow, the guiding principle is the same, here extending and there limiting the application of words, according as the division of labor requires.

"Psychology" has not escaped these vicissitudes. To the early philosophers the term was unknown. Nineteen centuries before its introduction Aristotle taught that the study of the psyche belonged to physics.¹ St. Thomas has given us one of his best psychological treatises in the "Summa Theologica." And it is not uncommon to find psychology included, by his successors, under the heading of "Special Metaphysics." Both in the Greek philosophy and in mediæval scholasticism, the science of mind was integrated with other sciences of a wider and deeper scope; its differentiation belongs to a more recent period.

Since the days of Melancthon,² Goclenus,³ and Casmann,⁴ who

¹ *De Anima*, lib. i.; Cf. *Phys.*, lib. ii. St. Thomas, in his "Commentary" on the latter (Lect. IV.), says that the soul, inasmuch as it is the form of the body, is treated by the naturalist; but so far as it is separable from the body, by the metaphysician. It is in this restricted sense that he understands the words of Aristotle: *Πῶς ὁ ἕχει τὸ χωριστὸν καὶ τί ἐστὶ, φιλοσοφίας τῆς πρώτης διορίσται ἔργον.*

² He is said to have first used the term to designate the subject of academic lectures.

³ *Psychologia*, Marburg, 1590

⁴ *Psychologia Anthropologica*, Hannover, 1594.

seem to have devised the term, "psychology" has had a variety of meanings. For those who were loyal to the Aristotelian philosophy, psychology meant the science of the soul in the broadest acceptance of this term. By the English successors of Locke, it was restricted to the study of mental phenomena. And many who claimed that psychology should include both phenomena and soul, accepted with Christian Wolff the distinction between "empirical" and "rational" psychology. It would be interesting, from the historical point of view, to trace this development and single out its factors. We might also, with profit, compare the definitions of psychology that are offered us by various existing schools. But, for our present purpose, a limited review will suffice.

Among writers of the neo-scholastic tendency we find considerable divergence regarding the scope of psychology. Mivart makes it as large as possible. "The action of the soul, or psyche, includes every action of the organism, whether plant or animal, of which it is the immaterial constituent, and each action of the kind is a 'psychosis' of one kind or other, there being, of course, vegetal and animal psychoses. The science of psychoses must, of course, be termed 'psychology.'"¹ Elsewhere he says that "psychology, according to its original conception and according to the most rational signification which can be given to the term . . . denotes the study of all the activities, both simultaneous and successive, which any living creature may exhibit."² Mercier's definition is less ambitious. For him, "*c'est l'homme seul qui constitue aujourd'hui l'objet de cette partie de la philosophie. Toutefois, si c'est l'homme seul, ce doit être l'homme tout entier, c'est-à-dire, l'homme envisagé dans toutes les manifestations de sa vie.*"³ Quite consistently with this programme, he devotes several chapters to life in general, beginning with its elementary functions displayed in the cell. More limited still is the plan adopted by Gutberlet, Schneid, Sanseverino, and others, who commence with the description of the sensitive faculty, thus confining psychology to conscious life and its subject. These differences among those who may be regarded as authorities, show us that, within a very wide range, no inflexible boundary can be fixed of which we may properly say: inside of this is psychology, outside of this is something else.

Extremes meet. Six months ago we learned that psychology is "that science of the thinking subject which can be derived from the data furnished by self-consciousness."⁴ Here we find the

¹ *On Truth*, London, 1889, p. 427.

² *The Cat*, London, 1881, p. 365.

³ *La Psychologie*, Louvain, 1892. Introd. vi.

⁴ CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1894, p. 632.

scope of the science marked off by the use of a particular method. With this first limitation we are not especially concerned, for though self-consciousness in different subjects may furnish conflicting data, and though the process of derivation may issue in opposite conclusions, we freely admit that introspection is essential to psychology. It is the other limitation that claims our attention. The "educated person" for whom this definition is intended, would naturally ask what is meant by the "thinking subject," and to clear up this doubt he is told that the "thinking subject" is man. This is proper, and, moreover, is in keeping with the doctrine of St. Thomas. Besides, it would be hypercritical to remark that man is something more than a "thinking subject"; that he is, for instance, the subject of sensation, emotion and volition. If these activities are not noted in a phrase which is meant to be an equivalent for "man," it is reasonable to suppose that the definition refers to man regarded under one formal aspect, that is to say, inasmuch as he thinks. And thus "psychology" undergoes a contraction.

The summer days having passed, the psychologist finds that he has a larger task, that his science meanwhile has expanded. It now "considers the ultimate causes or constituents of one of the beings in nature, and that the noblest being in all nature—man." If our psychologist has the presence of mind to recall his elements of ontology, he will remember that among these ultimate causes there is quite a variety—causes extrinsic and causes intrinsic, causes efficient and final, material and formal. If he further know what Christian philosophy and revelation teach regarding the causation of man, he may realize the height and breadth and depth of that which he is expected to treat. The efficient cause of man is God, and his final cause or destiny, beatitude. Intrinsically, man is constituted by the matter of his body and by his soul as a formal cause. A science which considers the ultimate causes of man must be a compound of theology, psychology, anatomy and physiology; and the scientist who undertakes the task must be a more wonderful compound still.

The discouraging effects of such a definition must have been foreseen, for it is immediately added, with characteristic consistency, that psychology "treats of man's soul, which is the ultimate constituent principle in him." Here at least the extrinsic causes disappear, and this is a relief. Remembering that there are two ultimate principles in man, one is tempted to suggest that the word "formal" might have been brought into this second definition without spoiling the clearness or the construction. But too much must not be expected. If, after the main difficulties of the first definition have been removed, our psychologist is not able to unravel the rest for himself, his case is hopeless.

From what has been said, it might be inferred that the right to define psychology after this manner is called in question, and that the definitions themselves are hereby declared guilty of logical impiety. The inference, however, is unwarranted. So far as we are aware, there is no legislation to justify such a verdict, and until competent authority take action in the premises, we may as well leave everybody his full liberty. We merely wished to see how far "usage" had settled the scope of psychology, and we have seen. Whatever other charge may be advanced against the modern science of mind, it cannot be accused of violating a copyright when it calls itself "psychology."

We must note, moreover, that there is a reason for the elasticity of this term. The extent of the "logos" depends upon our understanding of the "psyche." If the last-named word be taken in the Aristotelian sense, psychology must treat of the plant-soul and of the brute-soul no less than of the human soul; it must be comparative. If "psyche" is synonymous with "the soul of man," differences naturally arise, according as the soul is understood to be the source of all vital functions in the human organism, or the principle of mental operations or simply the series of conscious states. To adjust these differences, to sift out the erroneous meanings of "soul," and consequently to give "psychology" a definite signification, would certainly be a benefit to the science. But how this is to be accomplished is just now a problem.

Of one thing, however, we may rest assured; the desired adjustment will not be brought about by extremists. As the principal difficulty lies in properly conceiving the union of soul and body, any excess, either in the direction of materialism or on the side of spiritualism, can only obscure the truth and widen out differences of opinion. Hence St. Thomas stigmatizes as *frivola et impossibilia* the views of certain Arabian philosophers, and to refute their arguments, insists that, if the intellect were a substance separate from the organism, no imaginable mode of "continuation" or communication could save the natural unity of man.¹ Unfortunately, his criticism, though trenchant, did not rid philosophy of this dualism. Revived by Descartes, it has been ever since a prolific source of confusion, not only in the central problem of psychology, but also in the fundamental notions of ontology. Witness the fate of the substance-idea from Spinoza down to the present.

Origen is charged with the parallel error of maintaining that the human soul is specifically the same as the angelic spirit. This exaggeration also St. Thomas refutes by enforcing the doctrine that the soul is the substantial form of the body. Whence he infers,

¹ *Contra Gent.*, l. 2, c. 59.

not only that there is a specific difference between the soul and those "separated substances," but that this difference exceeds that which exists between one angel and another. So great is it, according to him, that neither the immateriality of both nor their final destiny suffices to bring them within the same species.¹

In view of this explicit teaching, we are somewhat at a loss to know what is meant when we are told concerning the soul that "its world and atmosphere are in the first instance spiritual and abstract essences and individual beings like itself, remote from matter and immortal." If the metaphors could be brushed away from the metaphysics, this passage would present less difficulty. As it is, we must suppose that by the "world and atmosphere" of the soul is understood, in plainer language, the order of its being and activity. Nor can we translate "the first instance" by any other terms than "essentially" or "naturally." If now by "spiritual and abstract essences" we are to understand other souls, the sentence is mere tautology, and simply informs us that the soul belongs naturally to the order of souls. But if these "essences" are angelic substances, we fail to see how they can be called "individual beings like itself." Their individuality is that of a species complete in each of them, each angel being a species unto himself; whereas the soul is said, *minus proprie*, to be an individual being, inasmuch as it is a part of something that is specifically complete. Again, while the angels are naturally "remote from matter," the soul is, by its very nature, united to matter in the closest of bonds; that, namely, which joins matter and form in one substance.

The soul, of course, according to scholastic doctrine, has intellectual operations which prove its superiority to matter; but between the highest activity of the soul and the intellection of the angels there is a specific difference. Nor does the prospect of beatitude, to be shared by angels and men, demonstrate that the world and atmosphere of the soul are separated spirits. This destiny is supernatural, and, consequently, is not a criterion by which similarity, identity, or difference in nature can be ascertained. Figurative expressions, it is true, admit various interpretations, but until less ambiguous terms are employed, we are inclined to think that the world or atmosphere of the soul is, strictly speaking, the organism which it informs.

This excursion into metaphysics has taken us perhaps a little way from the direct line of our exposition. It seemed needful, however, to point out the real teaching of St. Thomas on the sub-

¹ *Ibid.*, l. 2, c. 94. Cf. *Summ. Theol.*, p. i., q. 75, a. 7. Q.Q. *Dispp.*, *De Anima*, a. 7.

ject, and to show that he repudiates an exaggerated spiritualism from which philosophical thought has so often recoiled, only to fall back upon the opposite extreme. Whatever be the value of his doctrines, historical justice demands that they should be fairly represented. But the demands of prudence are yet more imperative. At a time when Thomistic philosophy is proposed to the world as a remedy for the evils wrought by so many systems, the first care of its advocates should be to speak the genuine language of the school whenever they expound its doctrines. The effort which may be required to reproduce scholastic notions in modern English will bring its own reward. It will prove effectually that the "posthumous glory" of St. Thomas has not waned. It is also a more healthful exercise, morally and mentally, than can be gotten by setting up fictitious antecedents and consequents, in order to shatter them, sequence included, with a volley of denials. And it will go far towards removing those misconceptions which, for three centuries, have robbed the scholastic philosophy of its merits and of its influence.¹

To conclude: the diversity of opinion which we have pointed out, while it may be regrettable, is nevertheless instructive. First of all, if "psyche" and "psychology" admit such a variety of meanings, equal latitude must be allowed in the choice of psychological methods. So far as usage is concerned, "physiological" and "experimental" are adjectives that have as much right to qualify psychology as "empirical" and "rational." Again, in order that the experimental method may make good its claim for recognition, it is not bound to satisfy every arbitrary definition that may be given to "psychology." Provided it serve psychology understood in a restricted or even an imperfect sense, its rights must be acknowledged. If psychology, for example, be defined as the science of mental phenomena, we may quarrel with the definition and show that it sins by defect. But we cannot, on this ground, condemn as unpsychological a method which, within this limited scope, is used to good purpose. Finally, and *a fortiori*, we

¹ We did not state that the scholastic philosophy about the soul is "effete," and much less that it "passed out of existence somewhere in the sixteenth century." We suspect, however, that something must have happened to it about that time, for, according to the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, the downfall of philosophy coincided with the so-called Reformation. "In veteris doctrinae locum nova quaedam philosophiae ratio hac illac successit. . . . Hoc autem novitatis studium, cum homines imitatione trahantur, Catholicorum quoque philosophorum animos visum est alicubi pervasisse; qui patrimonio antiquae sapientiae posthabito, nova moliri, quam vetera novis augere et perficere maluerunt, certe minus sapienti consilio, et non sine scientiarum detrimento." As a consequence, "optimo itaque consilio cultores disciplinarum philosophicarum non pauci, cum ad *instaurandam* utiliter philosophiam *novissime* animum adjecerint, praeclaram Thomae Aquinatis doctrinam *restituere*, atque in pristinum decus vindicare studuerunt et student." The italics are ours.

are not justified in rejecting the experimental method because it leaves untouched those deeper problems which can be approached only by metaphysical reasoning. We might as well denounce arithmetic for not handling the questions that belong to trigonometry. The business of experiment is to furnish accurate data regarding mental processes; it has nothing to do with ultimate causes directly. But a psychologist who takes no account of these data, is as much to be commended as a boy who takes up trigonometry without knowing the rules of arithmetic. Hence we infer that the experimental method comes within the scope of psychology; more especially that it pertains to empirical psychology, and that, within the range of empirical psychology, it calls to its aid such means of investigation as are offered by physics and physiology. Neither usage nor etymology restrains us from accepting this inference, so that if, in other respects, the method be legitimate, its employment is not only permissible but necessary also for every psychologist who believes that the workings of mind deserve thorough investigation.

II.

That this condition is fulfilled might easily be shown by an appeal to facts, were it not that, at this point, an injunction is apparently placed on the whole proceeding. For it is urged that the new psychology is inoculated with philosophical error; that it teems with materialism, idealism, and all the other isms whereto the mind of man is prone. And if this saying be true, further argument on the matter is vain. On the other hand, we may be reminded that the scholastic authors hereinbefore cited, though they differ as to the comprehensiveness of the term "psyche," do nevertheless aver, each abounding in his own sense, that psychology is the science of the soul. Wherefore it may appear that, the soul being out of the reach of experiment, psychology is averse to the experimental method. There is, of course, nothing new about these difficulties, and, consequently, for well-informed persons the reply must be obvious. We have only to present here, in a certain order, the lines of distinction that suggest themselves to every reader of this REVIEW.

We note then that, in questions of this kind, it is not allowable to identify science with any scientist or with any particular school. A science is to be judged by its methods and by the data with which it enriches our knowledge. The interpretations put upon such results are worth no more and no less than the reasoning which supports them, and which can easily be tested by honest criticism. This is true even where deduction does not overstep the limits of the science in which research has been conducted. From an im-

portant discovery in optics, a physicist may deduce and maintain an erroneous hypothesis concerning the nature of light. Stahl, after rendering inestimable service to chemistry by distinguishing elements from compounds, erred in his conception of "phlogiston" as the principle of combustion; and the error was followed, in spite of Lavoisier's brilliant refutation, by chemists of the highest rank like Priestley and Scheele. It is one thing to get at facts by observation or experiment, and another to explain them, to point out their bearings and to generalize their meaning. If the deduction is correct, so much the better for its author and for science. If it is faulty, it will sooner or later be discarded; but the facts which suggested it and the merit of their discoverer will remain.

Conclusions that extend beyond the confines of a science have greater need of vigorous control. Apart from the evils of "hasty generalization," mistakes may occur through neglect of the data supplied by other sciences. False philosophical assumptions may vitiate a demonstration which otherwise is sanctioned by logic. And scientists sometimes exult in the assurance that they have demolished a "dogma," when, in reality, they have only upset a conception of their untheological fancy. In all such cases we have a right to challenge conclusions, but the scientific data must be retained, and credit must be given to the men who brought them together.

When, however, we are obliged to reject the views of individual thinkers, we are not thereby authorized to brand the science itself as erroneous. Some astronomers do not believe in the existence of God; does it follow that astronomy is atheistic? Some philosophers hold that God is the Unknowable; does this prove that philosophy is agnostic? And because many modern interpreters of Scripture are of the rationalistic school, are we to conclude that exegesis and rationalism are one and the same? With equal justice we might infer, from the numerous cases of Daltonism, that vision in general is delusive and color-perception a snare. We do not accept these absurd conclusions for the obvious reason that no science is locked up in the brain of any one scientist as his exclusive property, while we know, on the contrary, that in all these branches orthodox thinkers are at work.

The same holds good of experimental psychology. The question of its materialism, idealism, or spiritualism is quite independent of individual opinion regarding the nature of mind. Such opinion may be aprioristic, the result of philosophical bias; or it may, though arrived at by original unprejudiced thinking, rest on defective reasoning. The blame in this case attaches, not to the empirical research, but to the metaphysics of the individual. A

man may be a Newton at experiment and yet cut a sorry figure as a metaphysician. And it is no less certain that minds habituated to metaphysical subtleties may err in their appreciation of empirical data.

To apply this criterion, let us suppose that psychologists are in perfect harmony; that they are all thorough-going spiritualists and ardent scholastics. Are we warranted in saying that experimental psychology is fragrant with spiritualism? Not in the least. Gratifying as it may be to have all the elements of truth, empirical and speculative, fitted into a system, the spiritualism lies, not in the obtaining of results by experimental methods, but in giving those results a meaning concordant with the principles of spiritualistic philosophy.

Let us suppose, on the other hand, that all psychologists of the modern school are out-and-out materialists, idealists, or skeptics. Does it follow that experimental psychology is "reeking" with any of their isms? By no means. The only permissible conclusion is that a certain number of people, imbued with a certain sort of philosophy, are shrewd enough to seize upon every scrap of truth furnished by experiment and make it appear that theirs is the only logical interpretation.

But now, hypotheses aside, we find that no such harmony exists; that a great variety of philosophies is found among those who uphold experimental psychology; and that, in spite of these differences, the science is fairly progressing. Under these circumstances, it must be clear that neither an array of eminent names nor a long list of quotations can help us to determine the philosophical value of experimental methods. The spiritualist, no doubt, might derive consolation from passages like this: "Were the mechanism of the brain-processes with which an individual soul-life is connected, ever so clearly exposed to our view in every detail, all that we would get would be a highly complex arrangement of molecular movements. As to the psychical import of these processes, we would learn nothing. They might just as well belong to a lifeless mechanism as to the physiological basis of consciousness."¹ He might also read with pleasure a modern refutation of the "Mind-Stuff Theory";² and it surely would not grieve him to find a recent author proving the existence and unity of a supra-organic soul.³ But, *quid inde?* Just as many authors might be cited on the other side, while in the writings of one and

¹ Wundt, *System der Philosophie*, Leipzig, 1889, s. 583. Cf. Du Bois-Reymond, *Über die Grenzen des Naturerkennens*, Leipzig, 1872, s. 17, 25. Huxley, "Science and Morals," in *Fortnightly Review*, December, 1886.

² James, *Principles of Psychology*, vol. i., p. 145.

³ Ladd, *Elements of Physiological Psychology*, New York, 1891, part iii.

the same author contradiction, apparent or real, could be detected. Such a compilation would only puzzle the compiler. He might, of course, count the authorities on one side and on the other, and conclude that materialism is so many per cent. in advance. But this would be a trick of statistics, showing a good deal about psychologists and nothing about psychology itself. Except for pointing out differences of opinion, as was done a few pages back, citation in this connection is worthless.

Let it be granted at once that some psychologists have gone astray in their philosophical deductions. We may criticize and cast aside their conclusions, but the error which these contain does not destroy the facts from which they are drawn. We are far, of course, from maintaining that every statement of "fact," or every account of investigation, is infallible. When a psychologist has earned a reputation for thoroughness and precision, we take up his publication with a degree of confidence which we might withhold from another in whom these qualities are wanting. But favorably disposed as we may be, we do not credit an author's statements simply because they are his. His experiments can be repeated, his methods examined, and possibilities of error discovered which may have escaped his scrutiny. If he calls attention to a mental peculiarity hitherto unnoticed, or enters into a field before unoccupied, the credit which must be given him as a pioneer does not vouch for his explanations.

In the same spirit those generalizations are to be treated which, within the bounds of empirical psychology, tend more and more to become laws and guiding principles of the science. A man who has grown familiar by personal research with the whole domain of psychology and with its kindred branches, deserves a hearing when he advances a synthetic view. But our respect for him does not prevent us from thinking for ourselves, nor enroll us, despite our better judgment, in his "school." In other words, authority, be it ever so weighty, is neither a source of argument nor a final criterion in modern psychology. Much less has the "modern school" delegated any individual or body of individuals, to go before the thinking world and make a profession of philosophic faith in the name of the new psychology.

Whoever is conversant with psychological literature understands the real situation. Scarcely a piece of work has been done in the last three decades which has not received vigorous, though straightforward criticism. Not an hypothesis, however ingenious, has been advanced without calling forth discussion; and no theory, however well supported, has passed unchallenged into general acceptance. This we understand if we keep in mind the nature of scientific progress, and especially the vicissitudes through which

a new science must pass before it issues from the cradle stage. But at the same time this independence of research in regard to details that might seem trivial, is an evidence that no one psychologist is having it all his own way, and moulding the science immutably upon his opinions. It is also sufficient proof to fair-minded people that psychology is not committed to any tendency that would finally plunge it into philosophical error.

A recent statement, brought forth after some labor of demonstration, informs us that "the question of the soul itself, therefore, is altogether philosophical, or, as Aristotle puts it, is 'metaphysical,' that is, 'after physics,' behind it, beyond it, belonging to the ultimate causes of things." There is more pith than pertinence in this remark. As an admonition to modern psychology it is, to say the least, superfluous. If the new Czar, in his first official communication, were to inform the Powers that Siberia being after, behind, and beyond the Ural Mountains is a portion of Asia, and were further to enforce this declaration with manifold proofs, the mildest comment in diplomatic circles would be a smile. And a similar comment will light up the faces of psychologists when they are told, for their correction, that the question of the soul itself is metaphysical. If there is one point on which they are nearly unanimous it is this: they declare, implicitly or explicitly, that the nature of the soul is beyond the range of empirical research. Any attempt to convince them of this, is after and behind the actual state of the science.

For this very reason experimental psychology occupies a neutral position. *Per se*, it is neither monistic nor dualistic, neither materialistic nor spiritualistic. Any system that pretends to define the ultimate subject of mental processes is philosophical. It is based on the principle that every operation must proceed from a substance. What is this substance? "The brain," says one; the "immaterial soul," says the other. These are the ultimate terms of opposite deductions. But evidently, in order that either may be reached, a certain preparation is necessary. The materialist, with one end in view, strives to show that all mental phenomena are essentially organic; the spiritualist, aiming at a different conclusion, insists upon the distinction between lower and higher operations. Experimental psychology, however, leans neither to one side nor to the other. Its postulates are as independent of materialism as they are of spiritualism; it does not undertake to say what the soul is or what it is not.

How, then, can the new science style itself "psychology" at all? To vindicate such a claim it ought certainly to tell us something about the psyche. But if it eschews the "question of the soul itself," what addition can it make to our knowledge of mind?

This question is easily answered if certain elementary notions are presupposed. Neither a dictionary nor a treatise on epistemology is needed to convince the average mind that there are many ways of "knowing" a thing. Much less will such a mind, honesty taken for granted, infer that knowledge of one sort implies knowledge of every sort concerning the same object. Who does not know what air is? And yet comparatively few are aware that it is a mixture of oxygen and nitrogen. Who does not know what life is? Yet the deepest thinker may be puzzled for its definition. Who has not felt pain and pleasure, love, anger, pity and fear? But ask for an analysis of these emotions and see how often the answer will be correct. Indeed, there is no end to the list of these common *Erlebnisse*, which in a sense are known and in another sense are unknown. To know, that is, to have experience of, such facts is not only easy but is, in many cases, unavoidable. To know, that is, to understand and scientifically to account for, our daily experiences, is not only difficult but is, in some cases, impossible.

Considerations like these may have suggested to St. Thomas the important distinction which he uses in discussing the knowledge which the soul may have of itself. The mere perception of his conscious states tells each man that he has a soul, and therefore responds, by a sort of experiential knowledge, to the question, *an anima sit*. But to answer the question, *quid anima sit*, to define the soul's nature in terms of universal and scientific import, a thorough examination of its acts is needed.¹

The same distinction applies, of course, to the knowledge of the acts themselves. Every one knows by experience what it is to see, to hear, to imagine, to remember, to hesitate, to decide. But not every one is prepared to tell us in what these several processes consist. Thus when we are asked, "Who does not know what attention is?" we can only reply, that depends. If "knowing" means simply acquaintance by experience, we take it that most adults, in possession of their faculties, know what attention is. But if a precise knowledge as to the nature of attention be called for, we shall seek it in vain from the majority of people. "It means the application of the mind voluntarily and freely, or that of any sense, to one object in preference to others, and with more energy than is required for a cursory glance or perception." At first sight we are uncertain whether the adverbs "voluntarily and freely" are meant to include the "application" of the senses; but the doubt is removed by the sentence which immediately follows. "It implies an effort proceeding from a desire of the free will to

¹ *Summ. Theol.*, p. i., q. 87, a. 1.

know." From this general statement we infer that attention, in all cases, is a free and voluntary application.

The principal merit of this definition is the facility with which it can be verified. We know, for instance, how "freely and voluntarily" we turn our attention when our neighbor slams his door emphatically, when a drop of melting wax falls from our candle upon our unexpectant hand, and when, in the street-car, our toes receive the weight of a careless fellow-passenger. We recall the eager desire of our "free will to know" in virtue of which we have managed, at sundry times, to attend to a toothache. And no Christian, of course, will henceforward dare to excuse his distractions in prayer on the plea that such wanderings of the attention are, or may have been, involuntary. In a word, nothing engages our attention, unless our free will expressly ordain. This exquisite psychology may suit beings that dwell in the world and atmosphere of ideal perfection. But lest ordinary mortals should become scrupulous or discouraged, we must remind them that modern psychology, with all its waywardness, distinguishes two sorts of attention, one of which is determined by the force of outer impressions, the vividness of a mental image or the absorbing power of an idea; and another in which the will exercises control.¹ With this distinction to guide him the reader may see how complete is the definition which we have just examined. By a strange unselfish oversight it was brought in directly after the question, "Who does not know what attention is?" Remarks that follow in the same paragraph prompt us to ask, Who, with any scientific training, does not know the difference between defining attention, or any other process, and describing the conditions on which it depends? The new psychology has not discovered attention, but it has shown up some features in the process which are well worth studying before a definition is attempted.

Supposing, now, that we desire a scientific knowledge of any mental activity, we see at once that some method must be followed. As in the natural sciences, random investigation is fruitless, so with much greater reason must psychology be a failure if it is not properly directed. And, as in those sciences which study things of the outer world, observation and experiment are used, so for the study of consciousness we are offered two methods—the introspective and the experimental. It was stated, however, in our former article, that experiment, far from setting introspection aside, necessarily includes it and renders it more perfect. The choice, therefore, is not between introspection alone and experiment alone, but between introspection alone and introspection

¹ The same distinction is pointed out by Michael Maher, S.J., in his *Psychology*, London, 189c, p. 332.

controlled by experiment. If, having thus to choose, we listen to certain critics, we must banish experiment entirely, because, as they are pleased to imagine, it implies materialism, idealism and all else that is not scholasticism. How do they know this? From the fact that among those who employ the experimental method some are materialists, idealists and the like. But what about those who, during twenty centuries and more, have relied on introspection alone? Were there and are there no materialists and idealists among them? Were these errors born in 1860, when Fechner's "Psychophysik" appeared? We venture to say that there is to-day just as much false philosophy concerning the soul among those who reject experimental psychology, as there is among those who are its promoters. And we therefore conclude that, if experiment is to be condemned on the ground assigned by such critics, pure introspection must also be repudiated. After that, what becomes of psychological method? We prefer to think that the choice is still open.

The critics think otherwise. They warn us, in every tone of the menacing scale, that the soul cannot be weighed and measured, seared with acids, spanned with compasses or twitched with electrodes. Really! The critics, of course, are fully aware that no such nonsense as this ever entered the mind of a psychologist. But it serves their purpose to pretend that danger is near and stoutly to battle with shadows. Out of a popular misconception they forge an argument against modern psychology, and with this weapon stand forth as champions of sound philosophy. But the alarm is groundless and the defense quite needless. There will be time enough for such protests when once it is proved that any adherent of the modern school is tampering, or trying to tamper, with the immaterial soul. And if, meanwhile, there be any intelligent person who would like to see for himself how experimental research is conducted, but is held back through fear of *psychalgia*, we are certain that the director of any laboratory in the land will gladly warrant such an inquirer perfect immunity, and receive him as an interesting subject.

Then the new psychology excludes the soul altogether, or, to use Dr. Ward's energetic expression, it is a "psychology without even consciousness."¹ Once a charge has been made, it must be sustained, and anything will do for the purpose. First, it is insinuated that experimental psychology is torturing, or trying to torture, the soul; then it is urged that the new science acknowledges neither soul nor consciousness. But the truth of the matter is simple enough. Experimental research, properly speaking;

¹ "Modern Psychology; a Reflection," in *Mind*, January, 1893.

neither includes nor excludes the soul, because it is occupied with the phenomena of mind. Here, again, it is on the same level with introspection. Self-observation, however long and thorough, does not, of itself, reach down to an underlying substance. When introspection has furnished sufficient data concerning our mental activities, we may, if we choose, proceed by reasoning to establish the existence of a soul and to demonstrate its peculiar nature. Similarly, when by experimental methods we have gained a more accurate knowledge of conscious phenomena, we are free to argue, with the aid of philosophical principles, that such operations must have such a subject, and that the union between body and soul must be of this or that character. But in its proper scope experiment does not, any more than does introspection, carry us directly to the essential source of psychical processes. If, in this respect, it is guilty and must be abandoned, the same sentence falls logically on the introspective method.

But even as confined to its own sphere, is the experimental method legitimate? In other words, can we, without materialistic implication, speak of experimenting on mental phenomena? As this doubt brings us to the core of the question, we may be pardoned for briefly referring to "rudiments." Let us see, first of all, what we mean by experiment. Through a circular opening in the shutter a beam of light enters the room, is intercepted by a prism, and spreads in spectral colors on the opposite wall. We observe that the spectrum is not round like the aperture but has the form of a band, and we seek the reason of this difference. The opening is enlarged, and the phenomenon persists. The prism is placed outside the shutter, and the same effect is produced. But when each of the colored rays is separately passed through a second prism, different degrees of refraction are noticed which account for the position of the colors in the spectrum. In thus varying the conditions of a phenomenon so as to single out its cause, we are said to experiment.

Can we, without becoming materialists, vary the conditions of mental activity, note the effect of each variation, and hence determine what causes are at work? In a certain measure, we are all more or less given to psychological experiment. Who has not at one time or another, brought various images and ideas into his mind and observed the consequent flow of emotion? Self-knowledge, again, supposes an accurate estimate of the tests to which we are daily subjected, and the best of people find out by frequent trial that certain considerations are more powerful incentives to right-doing than others. The range of such *internal* experiment is narrow, and fully to master it, no mean power of concentration is required. But in practical life experiment upon others is

constantly practiced. To say nothing of the orator who plays upon every chord of feeling, most people know how to pass from threat to flattery and from this to the hope of reward, when dealing with one from whom they expect a service. Skill in managing these psychological conditions, is the secret of success in the school-room, the pulpit and the diplomatic circle. Is there any materialism in this sort of experiment?

It is on the same principle that experiment, in the stricter sense of the term, proceeds. The only difference is that, for the sake of scientific accuracy, we are obliged to isolate as far as possible the mental phenomena which we study, to place our subject in the most favorable circumstances, and to vary the conditions by fine gradations which in some cases necessitate nice apparatus. If there is no materialism in observing conscious changes which we produce in ourselves, there can certainly be none in observing and making known the effect upon our consciousness of impressions produced and controlled by somebody else. But if this be admitted, it must also be clear that there is no materialism in comparing subjective estimates with the objective stimuli or stimuli-differences to which those estimates refer.

It is a fact of experience that the same interval of time seems longer or shorter according to the way in which it is filled. Any one can test this datum in various ways—by spending an hour at mathematics, another with a novel, a third in pleasant conversation and a fourth with the headache. But suppose that a person desires to know what his estimate of duration is, apart from these occupations or experiences. Sitting quietly in his chair and thinking only of time as it lapses, he readily distinguishes between one interval of two minutes and another of five. Yet in this case his attention, under an excessive strain, fluctuates, and he is obliged to select smaller intervals within which it is fairly constant, such as seconds and fractions of seconds. As, moreover, his watch, besides the distraction and loss of time involved in looking at it when the intervals end or begin, does not give him clear-cut, empty intervals, he arranges a series of signal taps which can be spaced at will and be automatically sounded. But again, so long as he fixes the intervals for himself, he knows beforehand their respective lengths and in consequence his judgment is not without bias. To avoid this difficulty, he gets a friend to take charge of the signals, while he, without knowing in advance either the interval lengths or the order in which they are to be presented, has simply to give them his attention, and declare whether the first or second seem longer. His judgments are then compared with the actual intervals, and are found to be more or less accurate.

A gradual transition, each step of which is enforced by the na-

ture of the problem, thus leads from the observation of a familiar fact to the extremely delicate research, whose results converge upon what is known as the "time-sense." If any one will kindly point out in this transition from introspection to experiment, a phase that is tainted with materialism, idealism, or theological impiety, we will be grateful. And yet in all the work of modern psychology there is no more typical experiment than the one we have just described. We conclude that so far as the essentials of the experimental method are concerned, it may be as properly applied to mental phenomena as to those of the physical order.

It is urged, however, that certain forms of experiment tacitly imply that mental activity is a material something. We hear a good deal nowadays about "psychical measurement" and "quantitative results" in psychology. Can anything be measured that is not material, and can there be a "psychometry" that is not materialistic? The objection is specious; but it crumbles the moment we remember that magnitude does not necessarily mean extension. There is a magnitude of intensity and another of velocity. Nobody claims that mental processes are measurable because they are extended; but it is claimed that they have an intensity and a time-rate which can be measured. In determining the latter we do not assume that the mind moves through a given space in the unit of time; this would savor of materialism, or rather of foolishness. What we say is that the mental process endures while a physical object passes through a certain space, while the hand of a chronoscope, for instance, travels over a part of the dial. In measuring the intensity of psychical acts, we do not compare them with a physical unit like the centimeter or gramme. We compare one sensation, for example, with another, and then compare our estimate of their equality or difference, with the variations of the external stimuli.

It cannot be denied that our mental processes have a duration, whether this be called with St. Augustine *tempus*, or, with St. Thomas, *vicissitudo quaedam intelligibilium operationum*. It is certain, also, that our sensations, emotions and volitions have various degrees of intensity. Have we not been told in the definition, which we considered a few pages back, that attention is "the application of the mind . . . with *more energy*¹ than is required for a cursory glance or perception?" But if there is no materialism in admitting that mental processes have a strength and a speed of their own, there can be no materialism in comparing these magnitudes, after the manner above described, with magnitudes in the physical order. Difficulties there doubtless are, and numerous

¹ Italics ours.

sources of technical error. These were sufficiently indicated in the July number of this REVIEW, along with the methods by which they are obviated. But the principle itself, viz., that psychical acts can be measured, admits of no question.¹

These notions sufficiently show that, in order to determine the intensity of sensations, it is not necessary to suppose that they consist "of motions running up to the brain and down again," nor to admit that in the hands of experimental psychology, "sensation becomes a question of mere molecular physics, a form of motion, vibration, extension." The integrity of the nervous system from the peripheral organs to the centre is a *conditio sine qua non* of external sensation. Many peculiarities of sensation are in direct dependence upon the laws which govern neural transmission. And this is what we should naturally expect, if, as scholastic philosophy teaches, sensation is a function, not of the soul alone nor of the body alone, but of the body-soul composite. But to establish such relations is by no means the same as to identify sensation and nerve-current. Much less is it equivalent to saying that sensation is an affair of molecular physics, for, except by means of slender hypothesis, the ultimate nature of neural transmission is unknown. Were it shown conclusively that stimulation travels along the nerves by chemico-mechanical processes, this would not imply that the resulting conscious phenomena are simply the vibrations or combinations of material particles. And so far as the possibility or value of psychological experiment is in question, it matters little what physiologists hold regarding the final processes that take place in fibres, ganglia, and gray matter.

The proof of this statement is furnished by the much-abused and, in some cases, little understood psycho-physical methods. Whoever will take the trouble to study these methods, instead of trying to besmirch them with Kantism or Hegelianism, will see that they are essentially based upon the conscious nature of sensation as distinct from mere nerve-function. They are, in fact, nothing more nor less than a systematic comparison of subjective estimates and objective stimulation. They can be applied without so much as a reference to nervous tissue and molecular motions. And if, for the interpretation of results, physiological considerations are helpful, these do not reduce sensation to mere molecular impact. On the contrary, by sifting out the unconscious elements in an intricate process, they set forth in stronger relief the conscious factor which is sensation.

That physiology and psychology are in contact at many points,

² Other difficulties are ably answered by Gutberlet, "Ueber Messbarkeit psychischer Acte," in the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* (Fulda). V. Bd. (1892), s. 42 ff. and VII. Bd. (1894), s. 381 ff.

is too obvious for denial. But it does not follow that, even in the study of sensation, the former science can supplant the latter. Physiology, proceeding by external observation, regards the nervous system as a mechanism in which transformations and redistributions of organic matter and organic energy take place in accordance with physical and chemical laws. Introspective psychology, based on internal observation, deals immediately with facts of consciousness. Between conscious states and nerve-processes there is a correlation of some kind, and it is this correlation that physiological psychology investigates. Thus combining the researches of two sciences, it must partake also of their methods. From physiology it receives numerous and invaluable data, by which it is directed in the work of experiment and especially in the application of external stimuli. On the other hand, physiology must confess that its own explorations are far from being perfect. It has not penetrated those brain recesses in which the immediate physical antecedents or consequents of mental processes are hidden. Hence we are obliged, as a rule, to consider the more remote causes of such processes, namely, the physical agencies that impress our peripheral organs of sense, and to compare their qualitative and quantitative variations with the corresponding changes in consciousness. For the orderly carrying out of this comparison, psycho-physical methods have been devised, in which, as was already noted, the principal stress is laid upon the peculiarities of our subjective estimate.

From this point of view it is possible to answer a query that has recently, with more or less wisdom, been propounded. Of Weber's law it is said: "This acute inference means that when we compare we compare; that we feel one impression, say of heat, to be stronger than another; but we do not forthwith know that the hotter object is precisely 95° F., and the cooler object just 70° F. . . . The estimate we form of this profound conclusion is, What has it to do with psychology except to call attention to a circumstance of sense which was perfectly well known?"

Let us see. The value of a conclusion depends upon the value of its antecedents, and, in this particular case, upon the value of a comparison made between two sensations. Now, to begin with, scholastic writers consider the ability to compare sensations as evidence that man is endowed with supra-sensuous powers. This argument they adduce in works on "psychology."¹ Secondly, every such comparison involves the perception of a relation and a judgment, and these operations may possibly concern psychology. Thirdly, the discernment of a difference between the stimuli sup-

¹ See Michael Maher, S.J., *op. cit.*, p. 237.

poses a concentration of the attention which is greater in proportion as the difference decreases. And attention, we have been told, is an application of the mind, an effort of the free will, with a desire to know. Perhaps the psychologist might find something in this. Fourthly, the various deliveries of consciousness, in the course of such a comparison, include the ideas of identity and non-identity, inasmuch as the experimentee has to say when the two sensations appear to be the same and when they appear to be different. But these ideas, we should think, are not altogether foreign to psychology. Fifthly, the outcome of this and many other comparisons is that the character of each conscious state is determined in great measure by contiguous states; in other words, that it conforms to the "law of relativity." Here, at any rate, psychology has something to say. Sixthly, it being our turn now to ask a question, we should like to know what right any one has to say that this comparison, with all the processes involved, is a "circumstance of sense?"

Weber's inference was, perhaps, too "acute," for it means something more than "that when we compare we compare." It means that in consciousness there is an activity which cannot be resolved into a phase of physical energy, and a causality which is not identical with that whereby material effects are produced. Whether this meaning is of interest to psychology, others may decide. We merely wish to observe that the criticism just quoted betrays a slight misapprehension. In psychological experiment the subject is not required to know, either "forthwith" or later on, the physical intensity of the stimuli which he judges. He is not asked to guess at thermometer readings when he estimates two impressions of heat. He has only to say when the impressions appear to be equal and when they appear to differ. Comparing afterwards his judgments with corresponding intervals on the thermometer, we get a measure for his sensibility and for his power of discrimination. This power would be rather low if 25° F. in objective temperature just sufficed to produce a subjective difference, not because the subject failed to recognize one stimulus as being at 70° F. and the other as being at 95° F., but because 25° is so large an increment relatively to 70° , the first term of the comparison. We conclude that Weber's little inference contained some "circumstances" that were not "perfectly well known," if "perfectly" be synonymous with "universally."

Similar questions have been asked by critics and might be answered here in detail, were it at all probable that their purpose is to get information. But they are mostly rhetorical forms of the charge which is baldly put in the assertion, that "the study of physiological psychology leads to materialism." The "leading"

may consist in a philosophical deduction from experimental results, and in this theoretical aspect the accusation has been sufficiently repelled. Or again,—and more likely,—it is meant that the study leads to materialism by its practical effects, by tying down the mind to researches with apparatus of brass and steel and other hard metals, by compelling an exact knowledge of mental processes, and by subjecting these to all sorts of tests, modifications and measurements. Therefore, physiological psychology must be condemned, its study classed among the black arts and its haunts avoided by all right-minded people.

Let us apply the same argument to other lines of research. The study of medicine leads to materialism. The study of the Bible leads to heresy and rationalism. And the study of almost any branch leads to insanity. Therefore, medicine, Scripture and science in general are to be shunned by the righteous. Whoever relishes the latter conclusion is welcome, so far as we are concerned, to accept the former. But intelligent persons, we think, will perceive that the two conclusions are equally absurd and for identical reasons. Should some folk become materialists after studying experimental psychology, the trouble is with the students and not with the study, with their lack of logic and not with the principles of research. "But no amount of experimentation on the things of nature or on ourselves need make us mere experimentalists or empiricists, who will accept only that which is tested by physical experiment or is observed by the physiologist's eye." Precisely; the idea could not have been more cleverly expressed. But why write this on one page and on another endorse the statement that the study of physiological psychology leads to materialism? Physiological psychology has enough to do investigating mental phenomena and discovering their relations and proximate causes. Whether there is something beneath or beyond or behind those phenomena, is a question that it very properly leaves to metaphysics. Let us suppose that such speculations ensnare illogical minds in materialism. We shall presently see that this is an additional motive, not for rejecting the experimental method, but for accepting it and turning it to better account.¹

Before approaching this phase of the subject we may add a

¹ Some recent criticisms are noteworthy if only for their *naïveté*. Among the papers presented at the Catholic Scientific Congress held in Paris (1891), was one on physiological psychology by the Abbé Maisonneuve. Near the close of his article he says that "la psychologie physiologique se trompe ou nous trompe . . . quand elle se défend d'être spiritualiste ou matérialiste. . . . Elle aurait pu, elle devrait être un auxiliaire; elle est un ennemi." And then, forgetfully, he adds an exhortation: "Faisons, nous aussi, de la psychologie positive, pratiquons la méthode expérimentale, interrogeons les faits." See the *Compte Rendu*, 3d section, p. 153.

word in reply to the incidental charge of idealism. This has been already answered in a general way by showing that it would hold good against the introspective method also. Here we must recall a distinction, often overlooked, between two lines of research. What is the nature of mental processes, and how are they related or conditioned? This is the problem that psychology has to solve. Is there, outside of the mind and independent of its action, a reality of which those processes are true representations? This question is answered by the theory of knowledge. Any doctrine—idealism, subjectivism, or phenomenism—that answers it negatively, denying objective reality, is open, of course, to philosophical criticism. But such criticism does not affect experimental psychology, for the simple reason that it assumes the objective reality of those agencies which it employs to vary the conditions of mental operation. On this assumption the comparisons of which we have spoken are based, and if they prove that subjective estimates differ to some extent from physical relations, they do not destroy the reality of external stimuli.

We conclude that the experimental method is free both from idealism and from materialism, and that consequently it is as legitimate in this respect as the method of introspection.

III.

Hitherto we have dealt with the theoretical bearings of experimental psychology; we have now to take a practical view of it or rather of the relations in which it stands to a given philosophy, that is, to the philosophy of spiritualism.

It is possible, we admit, for some spiritualists to close their eyes in a sublime indifference to what the busy thinking world around them is doing. If they are apathetic in the practical matter of pedagogics, what may we expect of them in regard to the scientific foundations of pedagogics which are laid in psychology? "The final object of all education belongs to the sphere of pure psychology; it is the cultivation of the spiritual and immortal soul." We have read one or two treatises of the purest psychology without finding anything about education. What is meant, we suppose, is that pedagogics must keep in view certain truths established by pure psychology, such as the soul's spirituality and immortality. "Catholics understand this well enough. So well, indeed, do they understand it, made known to them by the light of natural good sense, and still more revealed to them by the light of divine faith which is in them, that they sit by uninterested and apathetic, while the world is agitated with a fever of 'educational thinking,' of 'pedagogic inquiry,' of investigation, groping for what children of the Church possess by a divine birthright." After this remarkable

admission there is added, strangely enough, a plaint. "And just as in fields of religious inquiry so in this matter, too, they are considered to be backward, to be behind the times, indolent and unenterprising, because, forsooth, they do not go about with a candle looking for some bits of truth when they have the whole of it to look at in the light of noonday."

Of late we have heard Catholics frequently accused on this score; but it is the first time that we have seen the accusation answered by a printed declaration to the effect that Catholics sit by, uninterested and apathetic, while the world is busy with questions of education. Nor is their sedentary habit in keeping with logic; for though they may know ever so clearly what the object of all education is, it does not necessarily follow that they know all about the means by which that object is to be attained. To get possession of these means, a mode of activity incompatible with the sitting position might be necessary.

Apart from these little oversights, the statement is rather interesting as a comment upon those conciliar decrees which enact that Catholic schools should be on a level, *institutione ac disciplina*, with other schools, which provide for the examination of teachers and insist upon the opening of normal schools.¹ If those who formulated such decrees are "uninterested and apathetic," they certainly took a singular way of showing their indifference.

The practical consequences of the statement could not have been fully foreseen. Among Catholic boys who enter Catholic colleges, there are some whose love of study is not all-absorbing, and who will probably rejoice to know that they can dispense with the candle and the groping after bits of truth. But others, with the curiosity of youth, may ask what the diploma means which they receive after four years spent in contemplating the whole truth. And others still, being perversely inclined, may wonder why they should go to college at all, when they have a "divine birthright" to the fulness of knowledge.

There is another consequence of the statement, which we hope was also unintended. It acts as an intellectual opiate upon such Catholics, parents and scholars, as are agitated by a fever of thinking, educational or otherwise, and imagine deliriously that the schools which they patronize ought to be as ready to advance and improve their methods as are other institutions. This unrest being hypnotized into apathy, it is not difficult to give the patients any number of suggestions, hallucinations included, as to the baneful results of psychology, inquiry, and investigation. We do not envy this mental condition nor dispute the birthright, human or

¹ Conc. Plen. Balt. III., 197, 203, 205.

divine, of any one; but we heartily wish that some one who has the whole truth in regard to psychology would divide, and save us the trouble of groping for bits. Until this be done, we must content ourselves with the candle-search, or, as St. Thomas calls it, the *subtilis et diligens inquisitio*.¹

It is unnecessary to argue that Catholic philosophers should not be apathetic concerning experimental psychology, because, as a matter of fact, the foremost among them have shown their interest. But how far ought this interest to go? It is something, at least, to find in scholastic manuals that their authors are in touch with the modern movement. Still more satisfactory is it when a writer analyzes experimental results, criticises the method by which they are obtained, intercepts the erroneous conclusion which they might seem to support, and gives their true interpretation. Writers of this class are too prudent to condemn *a priori* a course of research which, though conducted by materialists, may furnish facts in support of spiritualistic philosophy. And they know that in scientific criticism the anathema is of little avail. If the new psychology needs correction, as all its advocates admit, this can be applied honestly and effectually by any one who will study its methods. Weber's law has been modified, and, what is more, the modification will continue until a satisfactory formula is obtained. But the work of correction will be accomplished by painstaking research and decent criticism, not by angry accusations of formal error in Christian belief.²

It is not enough, however, that the advocates of spiritualism should appreciate the modern movement and give it their critical attention. A proper understanding of their own interests obliges them to take a more active part. The experimental method is unquestionably scientific, and the Church is undoubtedly the friend

¹ There are, nevertheless, some bright features in the statement to which we refer. First, it frees us from the necessity of upholding modern pedagogics, since no argument can avail where apathy is set up as a principle. Secondly, it shines by contrast, not only with the progressive educational measures of the Holy See, but also with the views of those who are on a nearer level. In the October number of the *Études Religieuses*, published by the Jesuit Fathers in Paris, an article by the Père L. Roure is worth reading. After showing that the results obtained by the modern study of the child-mind are in harmony with Thomistic philosophy, he adds: "The early education of the child must follow this evolution and be gradually modified with the varying phases of this evolution; it is seldom that the most abstract theories have no bearing upon practical life." In other words, according to this writer, the bits of truth which pedagogy may gather from modern psychology, are worthy of consideration. For a summary of the article, see *The Catholic Times* (Phila.), issue of December 1, 1894.

² One finds both pleasure and profit in reading such honest, intelligent criticism as that of Father Barberis in his paper on *L'Esthésimétrie et la Psychologie de St. Thomas*, read at the Catholic Congress (Paris, 1888). *Compte Rendu*, tome ii., p. 563.

of science. Volumes, in fact, are written to show that she favors the advance of knowledge. But the best argument for this thesis is the long list of names that are equally illustrious for scientific attainment and for devotion to Catholic belief. Why should not such examples be imitated and multiplied until Catholics take the lead in all departments of knowledge? It may be that in experimental psychology, as in many other lines, results come slowly. But no truth is trivial. It is better to have bits of truth than large blocks of something else, and there is no reason why Catholics should not have the honor of bringing even these fragments to light. There is no reason why we should not do in psychology what the Secchis, the Janssens, the Duchesnes, the Mivarts, and the De Rossis have done in other branches.

There are, moreover, special reasons for adopting the experimental method in the study of mind. In the first place, it is the best way to make criticism intelligent and thorough. One hour's work in the laboratory will give a clearer insight into the nature of method and experiment than a week of theoretical study. Personal research teaches the importance of details and their bearing upon large problems. And it is the only means of testing those subjective experiences upon which the conclusions of individual workers principally depend. Knowledge gained in this practical fashion secures the critic a proper hearing; he cannot be set aside on the plea that he is unacquainted with the subject.

Again, while we contend that the experimental method is not of itself bound down to any system of philosophy, we also insist that the results of experiment are susceptible of, and must finally receive, a philosophic interpretation. As Prof. Ladd, in accord with Herbart, Volkmann, and Wundt, very properly says, "the relation of psychology, as a science, to the philosophy of mind, and through it to all philosophy, is so intimate and binding that not one of the larger psychological problems can be thoroughly discussed without leading up to some great debate in the field of philosophy."¹ One of these "larger problems," if not the largest of all, is that concerning the union between organism and mind. Scholastic philosophy explains this by saying that the soul is the substantial form of the body. But if this metaphysical teaching be true, there must be correlative truths in the empirical order by which it is elucidated and confirmed. St. Thomas implies as much when he shows why the human brain should be relatively larger in man than in other animals,² and when, to prove the dependence

¹ "President's Address before the New York Meeting of the American Psychological Association" (Dec., 1893), in the *Psychological Review*, vol. i., No. 1 (Jan., 1894).

² *Summ. Theol.*, p. i., q. 91, a. 3, ad 1^m.

of intellection upon sensory processes, he adduces the abnormal conditions of the *phrenetici* and *lethargici*.”¹

That physiology and pathology have made enormous advances since the thirteenth century, no one can deny. Psychology, by taking their results into account, only follows more minutely and more accurately the example of St. Thomas. On the same ground, the results of psycho-physical experiment must directly or indirectly throw light on the connection between bodily function and mental activity, and, more remotely, upon the union of soul and body. If the spiritualist and the scholastic desire to maintain their position on this point and render it more intelligible to the scientific world, they cannot afford to hold aloof from experimental psychology.

But will they not, on entering this field, be elbowed by monists, idealists, and materialists? Granting that such will be the case, we answer that this is the strongest motive they could have for going at the work without delay. The experimental method is an effectual means of research. In itself it implies no philosophical error, but its data may be erroneously interpreted. See, now, the alternatives which confront the spiritualist. Either get hold of this instrument and use it for proper purposes, or leave it to materialists, and after they have heaped up facts, established laws, and forced their conclusions upon psychology, go about tardily to unravel, with clumsy fingers, this tangle of error. Either share in the development of the science, or prepare to wrestle with it when it has grown strong in hostile service. But do not imagine that at some future day, when the weight of scientific acquisition is all on one side, the scales can be tipped down in the opposite direction with a few general propositions and vehement assertions about philosophical “birthrights.”

While some spiritualists hesitate between these two courses of action, we may remind them that Leo XIII., besides laboring in many ways by word and deed to quicken the spirit of research among Catholics, says that they should take up the study of science, “per non lasciare quel campo aperto solo ai nemici, che da esso traggono copiose armi ad oppugnare molti veri sia rivelati, sia naturali.”²

It is interesting, also, to see which of the above alternatives has been chosen by the chief Catholic university of the world. In opening the courses of the “École Supérieure de Philosophie” at Louvain, Mgr. Mercier announced that, along with biology and physiology, experimental psychology would have a place on the

¹ *Ibid.*, q. 84, a. 7.

² Letter to the Abp. of Catania, *Abbiamo appreso*, Jan 4, 1887.

programme.¹ Among the most earnest workers in Prof. Wundt's laboratory last summer, was a gentleman who is to take charge of a similar institute at Louvain. And as the school to which this institute belongs was founded by the Sovereign Pontiff, we do not doubt of its success. We are confident that the researches made there will place its director high on the roll of honor.

Another illustrious member of the Louvain teaching corps, Mgr. De Harlez, has lately described the variations of opinion regarding the modern Science of Religions. At first "a goodly number of believers, and among them some eminent minds, seeing only evil and danger in the new science, wished to proscribe it for their co-religionists and to prevent them from establishing chairs from which it might be taught. Others, clearer of sight, better informed on prevailing ideas, on the needs of the situation, convinced, besides, that a divine work cannot perish, and that Providence disposes all things for the greater good of humanity, welcomed without reserve this new child of science, and, by their example as by their words, drew with them into this new field of research even the hesitating and trembling. They thought, moreover, that no field of science should or could be interdicted to men of faith without placing them and their belief in a state of inferiority the most fatal, and that to abandon any field whatever would be to hand it over to all sorts of error, intentional and otherwise." As a consequence, "to-day the most timid believer, who is at all acquainted with scientific data, no longer dreads in the least the chimerical monsters pictured to him at the dawn of these new studies, but follows with an interest as strong as his former fear, the researches, the discoveries which savants lay before him."²

The learned writer might have added that such a revolution of opinion is not without precedent. Passing over other instances, he might have recalled the appreciation which in Paris and Oxford, at the close of the thirteenth century, condemned St. Thomas as a dangerous innovator—a judgment that was completely reversed in less than fifty years.³ It is hard to say whether surprise or amusement is our dominant feeling when we read over the long list of "errors" imputed to the Angelic Doctor, and the pompous, ponderous periods in which he is denounced. And though their folly was so quickly shown, it is well for us that these documents

¹ *La Science Catholique*, Fév., 1891, p. 14.

² *The World's Parliament of Religions*, Chicago, 1893, pp. 605-7; cf. for the French text *Revue des Religions*, Sept.-Oct., 1894, p. 416.

³ See the *Dissertations* of De Rubeis on the works of St. Thomas, Diss. 25, 26; cf. *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* (Ed. Denifle, Paris, 1889), tom. i., pp. 624, 626, 634.

have been preserved. They teach us the value of others which reverberate against "modern science" in general and against the new psychology in particular. Some psychologist of the twentieth century will produce an interesting monograph on the "chimerical monsters" which were evoked to frighten people away from the Science of Religion and from other new branches of knowledge. In spite of such "monsters" the teachings of Aristotle became the rational basis of scholastic theology. Nor will similar chimeras prevent experimental psychology from serving that scientific truth in which all lines of research attain their equilibrium and live.

E. A. PACE.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

A NEGATIVE VIEW OF THE ENCYCLICAL "PROVIDENTISSIMUS DEUS."

PHILOSOPHERS call negatives ill-natured (*malignantis naturæ*), theologians dread them as minimizing, poets add that "one single positive weighs more, you know, than negatives a score"; but when there is question of scavenger work, the prim, sleek positive refuses service, leaving the "dirty job" to its less respectable brother. The disproportion between respectability and usefulness is not confined to yes and no, or to the pigeon and the buzzard; it has found its way from the world of words and of nature into human society, and even into the circles of literary and scientific writers. To illustrate our statement by a concrete case, when our sovereign Pontiff, Leo XIII., issued on November 18th of last year his encyclical "Providentissimus Deus," there was hardly a review or a periodical of Catholic tendency that did not reprint the same, whole or in part, with a more or less complete commentary on its meaning.¹ Not as if all these comments had

¹ Among the countless number of these publications, the following deserve attention: Father Brandi in *Civiltà Cattolica*, nn. 1048-1065; Knabenbauer in *Laacher Stimmen*, 1894, ii; Dr. Selbest in *Katholik*, Feb., March, April, 1894; Dr. Hoberg in *Kathol. Seelsorger*, Feb., 1894; Nisius in *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, 1894, iv.; Very Rev. Canon Howlett in *Dublin Review*, July, 1894; see also *Dubl. Rev.* for Oct., 1894; Conway in *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW*, April, 1894; Clark in *Contemporary Review*, July, 1894; Lucas in *The Month*, June, July, 1894; Maguire in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Jan., 1894; the Editor in *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Feb., 1894.

been purely exegetic or laudatory; but even the most adverse criticisms were couched in positive statements—a negative commentary would have destroyed the man of straw they attacked¹—so that the following exegetical NOES have not been wholly forestalled. Had they appeared before this, they would have been liable to misinterpretation, or at least, to an extension of meaning beyond their rightful limits.

I.—THE ENCYCLICAL IS NOT DIRECTLY DOGMATIC.

That the Encyclical documents of the Sovereign Pontiffs vary in their character between dogmatic, disciplinary and parenetic addresses, is plain from their difference in scope and contents. To exemplify this statement, we draw the reader's attention to a few of the Encyclicals of our present Pope, Leo XIII. They treat of the evils of Human society,² of socialistic errors,³ of the study of St. Thomas Aquinas,⁴ of the sanctity of Christian marriage,⁵ of the propagation of the faith,⁶ of political authority,⁷ of freemasonry,⁸ of the Christian constitution of civil society,⁹ of evangelical liberty,¹⁰ of the duties of Christian citizens,¹¹ of the abolition of slavery,¹² of the condition of the working classes,¹³ of the return of princes and nations to religious unity.¹⁴ Such a variety in scope and subject of Encyclical letters justifies in each given case an inquiry into the precise drift of the document, in order to ascertain whether it be chiefly dogmatic, disciplinary or parenetic.

Our Holy Father has deemed it right to entitle the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" "De Studiis Scripturæ Sacræ," not "De Scriptura Sacra," *i.e.*, on certain courses of lectures on Holy Scripture (which the bishops are advised to establish in their seminaries, if they have not already done so), not "on Holy Scripture."¹⁵ This points rather to a disciplinary measure than a dogmatic pronouncement. Not satisfied with this significant title, the august author in the exordium states expressly his purpose "to

¹ Among the adverse critics may be named the anonymous writer in the *Contemporary*, April, August, 1894; a pseudonymous writer in the *Rassegna Nazionale*; among Protestant publications which are not however, always written in an adverse spirit, we may name the writer in the *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1894; the Ritualist Ignatius as quoted in the *Catholic Times*, Liverpool; Mr. Gore, in the *Guardian*, April 11, 1894; the writer in the *Spectator*, April 28, 1894, etc.

² *Inscrutabili*, April 21, 1878.

³ *Quod Apostolici Muneris*, Dec. 28, 1878.

⁴ *Æterni Patris*, Aug. 4, 1879.

⁵ *Sancta Dei Civitas*, Dec. 3, 1880.

⁶ *Humanum Genus*, April 20, 1884.

⁷ *Libertas*, June 20, 1888.

⁸ *Catholicæ Ecclesiæ*, Nov. 20, 1890.

⁹ *Præclara Gratulationis*, June 20, 1894.

¹⁰ *Cf. Contemporary Review*, July, p. 42, note.

⁵ *Arcanum*, Feb. 10, 1880.

⁷ *Diuturnum*, June 29, 1881.

⁹ *Immortale Dei*, Nov. 1, 1885.

¹¹ *Sapientiæ Christianæ*, Jan. 10, 1890.

¹³ *Rerum Noverum*, May 15, 1891.

give an impulse to the noble science of Holy Scripture, and to impart to Scripture study a direction suitable to the needs of the present day.¹

To render the foregoing statement plainer still our Holy Father explains both the impulse and the direction he intends to give to the study of Sacred Scripture. The impulse springs from his "desire that this grand source of Catholic revelation should be made safely and abundantly accessible to the flock of Jesus Christ," while the direction suggests measures "not to suffer any attempt to defile or corrupt it (the source of Catholic revelation), either on the part of those who impiously and openly assail the Scriptures or of those who are led astray into fallacious and imprudent novelties." Thus far everything points to forthcoming disciplinary measures rather than dogmatic canons, though a certain amount of doctrine may be the necessary basis of the rules of action about to be issued.

This conclusion is not altered by a perusal of the document itself; the division indicated in the exordium² has been strictly adhered to throughout: A. The Holy Father incites to the study of the Bible for two reasons: *a*. Its utility; *b*. Its relation to the Church. *a* is both, α , doctrinal and, β , oratorical; α is proved by the words and practice of Jesus Christ, of the Apostles and of the Fathers of the Church; β is based on the authority of Holy Writ and of the Fathers. *b*. The Bible's relation to the Church is manifested, α , by express legislation (Divine office, school of Sacred Scripture in cathedrals and monasteries, dominical gospels) and, β , by the constant use the Church has made of the Bible (in the times of the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists, of the Alexandrian and Antiochian schools down to the period of the Scholastics to the Council of Trent and our own times). B. The Sovereign Pontiff directs the Bible study: *a*. Its exegesis, determining after a review of our present-day opponents, the training which professors should receive and the manner in which they should teach (introduction and laws of hermeneutics): *b*. The defense of the Bible against recent attacks: α . Its authenticity and credibility are to be established; β . The objections of orientalists and critics must be met; γ . The difficulties of the scientists are to be answered; δ . The exceptions of the historians and antiquarians must be satisfied; ϵ . Catholics ought to assist these studies by material aid. The Encyclical ends with an appeal to the bishops

¹ Cf. Authorized version, which will be commonly quoted throughout, though we shall have to take exception to a few renderings in the otherwise creditable work.

² We are sorry to see this division abandoned in the paragraph headings of the authorized version; unless the reader is very attentive he will be led to miss the logical structure of the Encyclical.

and priests to act according to the wise counsel of the Vicar of Christ upon earth. Notice once more that in all this there is nothing directly dogmatic, though the advice of the Pontiff supposes and implies certain dogmatic truths and even asserts them plainly (the inerrancy of the Bible, *e.g.*). It always does so with a view of establishing the correctness of the method of Scripture study inculcated in the Encyclical.

II.—THE ENCYCLICAL IS NOT INTENDED TO BE AN EX CATHEDRA UTTERANCE.

This point has already been emphasized in the "Dublin Review"¹ and in the "Contemporary Review."² The latter writer defends the moderation of Leo XIII. against the impatient expectations of the anonymous writer,³ and the former maintains his position against Mr. Gore's contention⁴ that the document "is meant to be an ex cathedra pronouncement," but that, "no doubt, some reason may be found to declare the Encyclical not infallible."

No Catholic disputes the Holy Father's right and power to issue an ex cathedra decree either in the form of an Encyclical or about some of the questions treated in "Providentissimus Deus;" but the venerable author himself has declared equivalently that he did not intend doing so in the document now under discussion. Had he intended his Encyclical to be regarded as an infallible utterance he would have in some way manifested his intention. Circular letters of the Apostolic See, as such, are not considered as ex cathedra pronouncements, unless they acquire this character through additional circumstances or expressed declarations. These failing, they do not claim to have been issued with the aid of the charisma of infallibility. Moreover, the rhetorical style and the oratorical language of the document, together with the manner of its publication, preclude the idea that it should be an ex cathedra utterance. Finally, if the document were an ex cathedra utterance, or had been intended as such, why should not the competent ecclesiastical authorities, who know and understand that theologians place the Encyclical on the level of the other circular letters, protest against this mode of interpretation and establish the document on its intended footing? This silence is as eloquent as the most sublime passages on the nature of inspiration and the divine authorship of our sacred books. It must, however, be kept in mind that the want of an ex cathedra utterance on a given point of doctrine or morals does not render that point doubtful, nor does it destroy the scientific value of the testimony solemnly uttered by the

¹ July, p. 74.

² Cf. *Contemporary Review*, April.

³ July, p. 48.

⁴ *Guardian*, April 11th.

witness, supreme in all matters theological, in favor of the Catholic character of certain tenets in dogma or morals.

III.—THE ENCYCLICAL DOES NOT TEACH VERBAL INSPIRATION.

Here we must first acquaint ourselves with the meaning of verbal inspiration. In Holy Scripture, as in every other book, we may distinguish between the contents and the form of the writing. When our papers and periodicals announced the death of the Czar of Russia nearly all gave the same facts and moral reflections, but their manner of expression varied. Applying this to our Sacred Books the question arises whether God inspired the very words of Scripture or only the truths and facts contained therein. But the concept of verbal inspiration must be limited still more before a definite answer can be given. There are in Sacred Scripture mysteries that could not have been clad in proper language by man left to his own resources, *e.g.*, of the persons of the Holy Trinity and the proper expression for the Word of God; again, there are passages in Holy Writ that claim almost expressly to be the literal reproductions of God's verbal revelation, such as the precepts of the decalogue and the forms of the sacraments; thirdly, the literary form of the inspired writings, whether historical or epistolary, their manner of expression, whether poetry or prose, their general arrangement and order of material, whether chronological or topological, appear to be the result of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. But the question we ask here is, whether, beside the general arrangement of the subject, the general manner of expression, the literary form of the writing, besides the sacramental and uncommonly privileged words, the Holy Ghost directly dictated all words and sentences, arranged all parts according to their division and subdivision, and colored all expressions with their peculiar hue of beauty and feeling.

It is true that to an uninitiated reader the words of the Sovereign Pontiff may appear to suppose such an inspiration as we have described. "Dictated by the Holy Ghost, it (the Sacred Scripture) contains things of the deepest importance" Again, "for all the books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical, are written wholly and entirely, with all their parts, at the dictation of the Holy Ghost." Besides, the Holy Father uses the words of St. Gregory the Great:¹ "He wrote it, who dictated it for writing; He wrote it, who inspired its execution." Finally, a similar saying is quoted from St. Augustine:² "Since they (the inspired writers) wrote the things which he showed and uttered to them, it cannot be pretended that he is not the writer"; for

¹ Praef. in Job, n. 2.

² Decons, Evgg. I, 1, c. 35.

"his members executed what their Head had dictated." From these passages one might argue thus: According to the words of the Sovereign Pontiff, the inspired writers wrote wholly and entirely under the dictation of the Holy Ghost, as the hand (member) writes under the direction of the head. But to write wholly and entirely under dictation, as the hand writes under the direction of the head, implies verbal inspiration. Therefore, according to the doctrine of the Sovereign Pontiff, the sacred writers wrote under verbal inspiration.

A remark concerning the major premise of this argument before considering the double meaning of its middle term. The passage rendered "for all the books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical, are written wholly and entirely, with all their parts, at the dictation of the Holy Ghost," differs somewhat from the Latin original. The latter reads: "Etenim libri omnes atque integri, quos Ecclesia tamquam sacros et canonicos recipit, cum omnibus suis partibus, Spiritu Sancto dictante, conscripti sunt," *i.e.*, "for the books, all and entire, which the Church receives as sacred and canonical, with all their parts, are written at the dictation of the Holy Ghost." The phrase "all and entire, with all their parts," does not qualify the phrase "under the dictation of the Holy Ghost" but the subject of the sentence. Such a transposition of the qualifying phrase may be of no importance where the *qualified* phrase is not susceptible of degrees; a dead man, *e.g.*, is as badly off as a man wholly dead. But in the passage now under consideration this is not the case; every one knows the difference between books all written under my direction and books written wholly under my direction, between men all black and men wholly black. The writer in the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY*¹ is, therefore, right in rendering the above passage: "For all those books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical, in their entirety and in their parts, have been written at the dictation of the Holy Ghost."

This observation modifies the middle term of the foregoing argument considerably; instead of having to deal with men who wrote "wholly and entirely under the dictation of the Holy Ghost, as the hand writes under the direction of the head" we have only "men writing under the dictation of the Holy Ghost as the hand writes under the direction of the head." The reader has no doubt, recognized that this expression is taken from the writings of St. Augustine and St. Gregory; we cannot, therefore, be wrong in attributing to it the meaning it has in those venerable authors

¹ April, p. 426, at top of page.

St. Augustine¹ states expressly: "To know this is of use both for our morals, in order to avoid and discriminate falsehood, and for our faith, lest we consider truth as so wrapped up in consecrated sounds, as if God commended to us the words spoken to manifest the truth, as well as the truth itself." The same holy doctor says of St. Jerome that he writes not only under the influence, but under the dictation of the Holy Ghost (*non tantum donante, verum etiam dictante Spiritu*). No one would on this account place St. Jerome, in the esteem of St. Augustine, on a level with the inspired authors of Sacred Scripture. St. Gregory the Great in his homilies, fully agrees with the doctrine of St. Augustine, while in another passage he receives Canon 41, certainly not written under verbal inspiration, as he receives the gospels.² The words of St. Jerome³ are more explicit still: "Let others seek after syllables and letters, but seek you for sentences. . . . Let my maligners seek and understand that in Sacred Scriptures not the words but the meaning has to be considered." Though Hass⁴ contends that the theory of verbal inspiration was received into the early Church with the dogmatico-Platonic doctrine, and though the Augustinian Father Fernandez⁵ endeavors to show that the theory of verbal inspiration agrees with the tradition of the Fathers generally, with the teaching of theologians and with the common principles of faith, these are only weak and stray voices, drowned in the general chorus of the present day theological writers who attest the contrary.⁶

When the Fathers speak as if every letter and title of Holy Scriptures were sacred, they merely emphasize the infallibility of the writing resulting from the divine assistance granted to the inspired authors; when they speak of the sacred writers as instruments of the Holy Ghost, they lay stress on the infallible impulse God exerted on the writers' will and God's consequent principal authorship of the Scriptures, without denying to the inspired writers the privilege of co-operating with God's work after the manner of intelligent and free agents; when they represent the inspired authors as composing under the dictation of the Holy Ghost, they express forcibly the fact that every truth contained in Holy Writ was, either mediately or immediately, either by revelation in its strictest sense or by a supernatural comprehensive judg-

¹ *De cons. Evgg.* 1, 2., c. 66; *cf.* ii, 28, c. 12, n. 27-29.

² *Ep.* 120; *Leo*, *ep.* 115, al. 73; *August.* *ep.* 82, 1, 2.

³ *Ep.* 57, ad Pammach. n. 6, 10.

⁴ P. 379.

⁵ *Revista Augustiniana*, Valladolid, 1884, vols. vii., viii.

⁶ *Cf.* *Innsbrücker, Zeitschrift*, 8385, pp. 670 ff.; *Schmids De Inspirationis Bibliorum Vi et Ratione*, pp. 280, 259; *Denzinger, Religiöse Erkenntnisse*, ii., pp. 238 ff.; *Sahanz, Christian Apology*, ii., pp. 418 ff.

ment concerning the truthfulness of facts and principles known by natural means, divinely proposed to the intellect of the same authors, without implying the necessity that the outward force should be divinely infused. Not to urge the wide meaning of the Latin word "dictare" (to say often, to dictate, to suggest, to counsel, to order, etc.), even its strictest meaning satisfies the foregoing patristic texts without resorting to verbal inspiration. Did not God dictate, at times, His truth in purely intellectual visions unmixed with the sensible apparatus of words? Did He not also make use of sensible visions, either of the imagination or of the external sense, without supplying the words needed to express the vision in language? Again, did He not dictate His truth in one language¹ where the inspired writer had to express the same in another language?² It is, therefore, not without reason that we distinguish the meaning of the middle term employed in the above argument; the inspired authors wrote under the dictation of the Holy Ghost, because they received from Him, mediately or immediately, all the truths they recorded, but not because the Holy Ghost supplied the outward expression of those truths. Again, the inspired authors wrote as free and intelligent agents and instruments of the Holy Ghost, and not as His dead and material tools.

In the light of this explanation we are enabled to understand the words in which the Sovereign Pontiff explains the nature of inspiration: "By supernatural power He so moved and impelled them to write—He was so present to them—that the things which He ordered, and those only, they first, rightly understood" (illumination of the intellect), then willed faithfully to write down (impulse of the will, rendering the writers instruments of God) and finally expressed in apt words and with infallible truth" (assistance during the writing). If we prescind from the diversity of opinion with regard to the nature of the supernatural light imparted to the writers' intellect concerning the truths they knew naturally, and with regard to the actuality of the divine assistance—whether it was "in actu primo" or always "in actu secundo"—these two questions excepted, on which the Encyclical is silent, it expresses the common opinion of Catholic theologians on the nature of inspiration.⁴

¹ Hebrew, *e.g.*

² St. John, *e.g.*

³ We do not like this rendering of "recte mente conciperent"; it appears to say that the inspired writers *always* understood the truth they were writing, an assumption that is denied by grave authors; Cf. Franzelin, *De Divina Traditione et Scriptura*, ed. 3, p. 358, coroll. 3, note 2.

⁴ Cf. Franzelin, *l.c.* Thes. iii., iv.; Schmid, *De Inspir. Biblior.*, pp. 1-114; Trochon, *Introduct. Generale*, pp. 52 ff.; Vigouroux, *Manuel Biblique*, pp. 14 ff.; Ubaldi, *Introd.*, ii., pp. 52 ff.; Densinger, *Religiöse Erkenntniss*, ii., pp. 223 ff.; Dixon, *On*

IV.—THE ENCYCLICAL DOES NOT ADD TO THE TRIDENTINE AND THE VATICAN DECREES.

We have already noted that the document is not directly dogmatic, but proposes doctrine only in so far as is required by the practical rules of interpretation inculcated. The dogmatic pronouncement of this kind most prominent in the Encyclical regards the inerrancy of Scripture. It is true that the Pontiff touches also upon the nature of inspiration, as has just been seen, but only by way of proving the inerrancy, inferring from the nature of inspiration that God is the principal author of Holy Writ, and that the sacred writers are only his instruments, so that any error in the text would have to be imputed to God himself.

But is not the doctrine of the inerrancy itself something beyond the conciliar decrees on Bible subjects? At least, is it not proved in a manner that necessarily extends the meaning of the Council's decrees? We grant that the Vatican Council did not intend to add anything to the Tridentine decrees concerning the *extent* of inspiration.¹ This was expressly and repeatedly stated in the Council itself by J. Simor, the Primate of Hungary, Cardinal Franzelin, the speaker on the order, end and style of the dogmatic "schema," V. Gasser and the reporter on the congregational sessions,² and is repeated in the classical commentary on the Vatican Council by Father Granderath.³ We also grant that the Council of Trent declared the Holy Scriptures as sacred and canonical not in general but in concrete form, "as they are had in the ancient Latin Vulgate," in which there are several contradictions,⁴ and, therefore, errors. Must we, then, grant that the Council did not establish the inerrancy of Sacred Scriptures since we grant the existence of errors in the concrete form of the books declared sacred and canonical by the Council? What has been said shows the fallacy of the argument for the inerrancy, as it is proposed by some writers. They enunciate their major, "si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus . . . pro sacris et ca-

Sacred Scripture, i., pp. 9 ff.; Mellini, *Instit. Biblic.*, pp. 14 ff.; Cano, de *II. theol.*, ii.; Suarez, de *fide*, disp. 8; Cherub, a Sancto Josepho, *Summ. criticae sacrae* iv.; Scheeben, *Kathol. Dogmat.*, i., pp. 100 ff.; Marchini, *De Divinit. et Canonicit. Biblior.*; Kleutgen, de *sententia Lessii*, appendix to Schneemann's de div. grat., etc.

¹ Cf. *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, 1894, iv., pp. 653 ff.

² Cf. *Coll. Lac.*, vii., col. 80, 86, 141, 522, 1621.

³ *Constit. Dogmat. Conc. Vat.*, Frib., 1892, p. 47.

⁴ Compare II. Kings, xxi., 8, with II. Kings, vii., 23, I. Kings, xxv., 44, and I. Kings, xviii., 19; also IV Kings, viii., 26, with II. Par., xxvi., 9, etc. Cf. Mariana, *pro Vulgata*, c. 22. For our purposes it suffices to notice the errors of this kind in the Vulgate. We need not, therefore, here enter upon the question of the Vulgate's inspiration or its immunity from all errors, even in matters not relating to faith and morals, or its immunity from all errors except in minor details referring to Bible animals and plants. Cf. Cornely, *Introd.*, i., pp. 442 ff.

nonicis non susceperit; Anathema sit." By thus mutilating the decree they make it treat of the Sacred Books 'in general, instead of their concrete form in the ancient Latin Vulgate, which cannot bear the extension these writers give to the clause, "intergros cum omnibus suis partibus."¹

Denying the inference, we may render its premises harmless in two ways: First. The Council determines the concrete form of the books which it considers as sacred and canonical by two qualifying clauses; they must be contained in the ancient Latin Vulgate, and they must be the traditional reading in the Church, Catholic not only in place but also in time.² If the Vulgate be taken in the light of this textual material, its present inaccuracies will no longer serve as an obstacle to the Church's declaration of the Bible's inerrancy. Second. Though the Council of Trent does not expressly insist on the dogma of Biblical inerrancy, it enunciates expressly the dogma on which Biblical inerrancy rests and from which it flows, by proclaiming in distinct terms that God is the author of both the Old and the New Testament.³ It is precisely from this dogma that our Sovereign Pontiff most emphatically infers: "It follows that those who maintain that an error is possible in any genuine passage of the sacred writings, either pervert the Catholic notion of inspiration (which is convertible with principal authorship), or make God the author of such an error." That this inference has not been clearly formulated by the Council proves nothing against our position, because, at the time of the Council, Biblical inerrancy was considered as a matter of course.⁴ If we may refer to Franzelin's view on the different stadia of a dogma,⁵ we can say that the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy has passed from the first period, in which it held undisputed sway in the theological world, to the second, where it is called in question; whether and when it will reach the third stage of a defined dogma, we must leave to history to decide.

But if Biblical inerrancy is really contained in the decrees of

¹ Cf. *Civiltà Cattolica*, n. 1048, p. 414, et passim; *Controverse*, 1884, ii., p. 545; *les Études*, 1892, i., p. 663; *Science Catholique*, 1893, pp. 239. f.; against these, *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, 1894, iv., p. 664 note.

² Cf. Cornely, *Introd.*, i., p. 452.

³ Cf. Denzinger, *Enchir.*, n. 666.

⁴ Cf. Canus, *De Locc. Theol.*, ii., 17; Bellarm., *De Verb. Dei*, i., 6; Corluy in *Science Catholique*, 1893, pp. 481 ff.; Franzelin, *l. c.*, *Thes.* iii., part i., n. 1, note; Dausch, *die Schriftinspiration*, Freiburg, 1891, pp. 45-86; Crets, *Dissert. Dogmat. de Biblior. Inspirat.*, Lov., 1886, pp. 257 ff.; *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, 1894, iv., pp. 670 ff.; Schmid, *De Inspirat. Biblior.*, p. 3, n. 4; p. 12, nn. 16, 17. Even Protestant authorities grant us this, as may be seen in Sanday's "Inspiration," *Bampton Lectures* for 1893, pp. 392 ff.

⁵ *De Divina Tradit.*, *Thes.* xxiii., p. iv.

the Tridentine and the Vatican Councils, can it be maintained that the clause "entire, with all their parts,"¹ has not been interpreted in the Encyclical as having a special bearing on this point?

Catholic theologians had given various interpretations of the word "parts:" *a.* Vercellone limits the extent of the "parts" to the deuterocanonical portions of Sacred Scripture that were rejected by Protestants at the time of the Tridentine Council.² This interpretation extols the historical occasion of the insertion of the clause "entire, with all their parts," at the expense of its obvious meaning in the decree, and of its intended object to prevent future errors similar to those of the early Protestants. *b.* Bukentop³ extends the meaning of "parts" so as to embrace every single sentence in the Sacred Books; we have already seen that the concrete form under which the inspired writings were proposed by the Councils does not admit such an extensive meaning. *c.* Franzelin⁴ limits the meaning of "parts" to the substantial entirety of Sacred Scripture, but in dogmatic and moral passages he too extends the meaning so as to embrace all utterances. The Cardinal grants that his position cannot be established from the words of the decrees, but he appeals in his proof to the scope and object of the Council of Trent. It is true that the Council announces its purpose of arguing from the alleged sources as from divine authority; but to have divine authority an argument need not rest on an *inspired* truth; it may be based on simply *revealed* truth, come down to us through tradition. The conciliar arguments do not therefore lose their force, even if they are based on a revealed truth that has somehow found its way into our copies of Holy Scripture. *d.* Cardinal Wiseman⁵ is of opinion that "parts" in the Tridentine decree means those portions of Holy Writ that are required to constitute the sacred books, morally speaking, entire. Portions of this kind would be, *e.g.*, the history of the resuscitation of Lazarus or the story of the adulterous woman. The common meaning of "parts of a book"; the occasion of the insertion of the clause "with all their parts"; the context "entire,

¹ The Authorized version reads: "The Books of the Old and New Testament, whole and entire, with all their parts, as enumerated in the decree of the same Council (Trent) and in the ancient Latin Vulgate . . ." This rendering appears to reduce the ancient Latin Vulgate to a mere catalogue, which, like the Tridentine catalogue, merely *enumerates* the sacred books. We have seen that the inspired books have been canonized by the Council not merely as they are enumerated in the Vulgate, but as they exist in it: "prout . . . in veteri Vulgata Latina editione habentur."

² Cf. *Revue Catholique*, Nov., Dec., Jan., 1866-67; Azevedo, *pro Vulg.*; Lamiy, *Introd.*, i., p. 172.

³ *Paedag.*, p. 26.

⁴ *De Script.*, Thes. xix.

⁵ Cf. Migne, *Demonstrat.*, t. 16, pp. 304 f.

with all their parts"; the absence of another satisfactory interpretation of the phrase, all these are as many arguments in favor of this last opinion.¹ The Encyclical, so far from giving the clause any new meaning in the argument, rather accepts it in the meaning last explained. The Holy Father repudiates "the system of those who, in order to rid themselves of these (historical and antiquarian) difficulties, do not hesitate to concede that divine inspiration regards the things of faith and morals, and nothing beyond" Among these authors may be classed, with certain qualifications, Newman, Mivart, Lenormant, Loisy, di Bartolo, Semeria, Savi, Rohling, Drey, Kuhn, Aberle, Schanz.² To exclude this error, the words of the Vatican Council are cited according to which inspiration regards "all the books of the Old and New Testament, in their entirety and their parts," historical as well as moral and dogmatic.

That the Holy Father wishes his argument to be understood in this restricted meaning is confirmed by his express words in which he appeals to what is "solemnly defined in the Councils of Florence and Trent, and finally confirmed and more expressly formulated by the Council of the Vatican." We have seen that the Vatican Council adds nothing concerning the extent of inspiration to the decrees of Trent; we have also seen the limits required by the concrete form in which the Council of Trent canonizes the sacred books; the Council of Florence merely inculcates the divine authorship of both the Old and New Testament.³ The Sovereign Pontiff, therefore, argues *immediately* indeed from the obvious meaning of the clause "entire, with all their parts," but *inferentially* from the fact that God is the author of Holy Writ; but neither argument adds anything to the conciliar decrees. This does not destroy the overwhelming value of the argument from Catholic tradition to which we have already referred.

V.—THE ENCYCLICAL DOES NOT ASCRIBE ABSOLUTE TRUTH TO THE WHOLE BIBLE.

This statement is almost literally expressed in the circular letter itself. "They (the sacred writers) did not seek to penetrate the secrets of nature, but rather described and dealt with things in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were com-

¹ It is quite another question how far the Church can declare the *entire* uniformity of our present Bible text with its original form: Cf. *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, 1894, iv., pp. 760 f.; *Nouvelle Rev. Théologique de Tournay*, 1893, pp. 428 ff.; Loisy, *Histoire du Canon du Nouveau Test.*, pp. 236 ff.; *Revue des Sciences Ecclesiastiques*, 1887, ii., pp. 103, 489; 1889, i., pp. 235, 390 ff., 481 ff.; Franzelin, *l. c.*, ed. 3, pp. 517 549, etc.

² Cf. *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, *l. c.* pp. 632 ff.

³ *Denz. Echir.*, n. 600.

monly used at the time, and which, in many instances, are in daily use at present, even by the most eminent men of science. Ordinary speech primarily and properly describes what comes under the senses, and somewhat in the same way the sacred writers—as the Angelic Doctor also reminds us—‘went by what sensibly appeared,’¹ or put down what God, speaking to men, signified in the way men could understand and were accustomed to.” This accommodation on the part of God to man’s ways of thinking and expressing thought may be extended without scruple or difficulty so far as men are accustomed to regard such relative expressions as contained within the limits of truthfulness. No man is regarded as violating the laws of veracity because he speaks of the rising and the setting of the sun, though the world is loud in its denunciation of a college of Roman theologians who censured Galileo for not adhering to the absolute truth of this Biblical expression. Our painters and poets are not considered as untruthful, though they represent their theme strikingly by expressing the surrounding thoughts and objects in a general and less emphatic manner; and shall we consider a Hebrew historian or moralist guilty of falsehood because he tells his facts in a manner customary among his contemporaries, because he states his measures and times in round numbers instead of decimals, because he writes under a name that had become almost necessarily connected with all similar literature, because he conveys under the form of parables and seeming histories important moral truths? If the Book of Job, excepting the historic facts concerning the sufferer, is a didactic poem on the philosophy of evil,² if Our Lord Jesus Christ himself narrates the story of Dives and Lazarus, are we, therefore, to call in question the relative veracity of either? We know that this relative truth has been urged to an excess; Jahn, Movers, and Scholz, though they be faithful Catholics, have denied the strictly historical character of the Book of Judith, Dereser and Scholz of the Book of Esther, others of the first eleven chapters of the Book of Genesis³. But abuse never shows the illicitness of proper use, excess never condemns moderation. The limits of relative truth in inspired writings are identical with its limits in profane authors; analogies, metaphors, figures of speech, national mannerisms of expression and style, poetic licenses and lyric flights, these are only a few of the instances in which we look for relative truthfulness. When doubt arises, when it is asked in Gen. 1:2, *e.g.*, whether the inspired writer has literally forestalled

¹ *Summ. Theol.*, i, p. q. 80, a. 1, ad. 3.

² Cf. Cornely, *Introd. II.*, ii, n. 177, p. 66.

³ Cf. *Dublin Review*, July, 1894, p. 77; *The Month*, June, p. 154.

the modern cosmogonic theories, we must ultimately refer to the tribunal that is supreme in all that refers to the authentic interpretation of the inspired writings, to the voice of the Church, the agreement, moral or absolute, of the fathers, the teachings of theologians, and the analogy of faith.

VI. By way of conclusion we may draw attention to a number of other negatives in the Encyclical which are less important in themselves but show the admirable prudence and caution of the Holy Father none the less. Relating what Catholics have done for Holy Scripture, Leo XIII. does not mention the Polyglott of Cardinal Ximenez; though condemning the opinion that the "Apostolic Gospels and writings are not the work of the Apostles at all," the Pontiff is silent about the authors of the Old Testament writings, only warning us against considering them as falsehoods and forgeries of men, as stupid fables and lying stories, as predictions made after the event or forecasts formed by the light of nature, as containing only startling effects of natural laws or mere tricks or myths; he does not forbid the use of non-Catholic books, but warns us to be prudent in their study; he does not condemn the use of internal evidence, but shows where it can be employed with the best effect; he does not bind us to the Vulgate text alone, but enjoins the use of the versions approved by Christian antiquity, and more especially that of the ancient MSS. Why, then, all those lamentations with which the *Contemporary* flooded the world? "With desolation is all the land made desolate, because there is none that considereth in the heart." ¹

WOODSTOCK, MD.

A. J. MAAS, S. J.

¹ Jer. xii., ii.

THE TREASURES OF THE CHURCH.

MORE than once have American friends put the question to the writer why it is that all the romance, philosophy, criticism, politics and poetry—the whole existence, in short, of Europe as known to them—is so deeply tinged with sadness. What has made men on this side of the Atlantic a melancholy race, who cannot sing but they must pitch their music in the minor key, neither write a story which shall not be tragical, nor look with favor upon a system of first principles unless its last word be annihilation, Nirvana and the everlasting silence? To a buoyant young temper, such as the native American prides himself upon possessing, there is something distasteful, not to say unreasonable, in all this continual sobbing and sighing which the ocean breezes bear across the waves from London, Paris, Berlin and the air of Leipzig. He turns away when it meets the ear, not as one might who is overcome with pity on occasion of another's trouble, but in the slightly contemptuous mood of a strong man at the bedside of an hypochondriac or a valetudinarian. These revolts and regrets, these elegies which are bathed in tears have no charm for the busy, energetic, hopeful citizen of a new world which is every day growing richer and more populous, and which, in spite of crises and defalcations, blizzards and earthquake, feels supreme confidence in the present and the future. What, then, our friends ask us wonderingly, has befallen the Old World that all its literature should resemble the prophet's scroll and be written over with lamentations and mourning and woe? Have we Europeans run our course, lived the span of life allotted to us, and are we nearing the end of our tempestuous chronicle? Is it the time of sunset in these ancient kingdoms, or does the dirge-like tone which pervades our latest compositions forebode the night and the darkness wherein other worlds, as fair to look upon as our own, have been engulfed? We are neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet; and who will dare to lift the veil which hides to-morrow from our eyes? But we can study the past; we may compare one period with another and note their likeness; we are bidden to watch for the signs that betoken great historic changes, lest they take us unawares. Is it possible, then, to overlook the morbid symptoms, the lack of vitality, the nervous unrest, the running to and fro and the steadily mounting agitation—the fever which has laid hold upon thousands in our most crowded cities, or the frivolity, no less feverish, that

reigns among the so-called upper classes, the wealthy, high-born, official and fashionable, who are girt round about with a ring of poverty-stricken proletarians, by no means content to abide in their forlorn condition? Our democracy, unlike the American, is a militant system; it means revolution. The old faith or loyalty or attachment to our born and predestinate rulers is passing away. Government, which was counted a mystery, has become an open secret; statecraft is now the eloquent rhetoric whereby a crowd can be persuaded to accept a fresh programme. Property must show its titles, and those not merely forensic but human, else it will go hard with it in the day of law-making, which is now, for so many interests, traditions, inheritances, monopolies and corporations, little less than the day of judgment itself. "*Quod populo placuit, id legis vim habeat*"—these words may be taken as briefly summing up the new order of ideas, not yet carried into effect at Westminster (no, nor altogether at Washington), but furnishing a creed and a propaganda, over against which no other principles seem able to stand.

Now, in America, the sovereignty of the people is a commonplace, and, as all men have built on this foundation, there appears a certain unity in the design, a simplicity which is likewise strength, that does not fail to impress strangers, be their sentiments friendly or hostile, who travel in the United States. But our condition in Europe is far more complicated. We find ourselves building up new institutions on the ruins of the old; mixing in one confused, though picturesque, edifice the styles of all ages, from early Egyptian, so to speak, down to that of the Renaissance, and always driven to a compromise between the present and the past. In consequence, neither the true blue conservative nor the reformer of root and branch feels much satisfaction on contemplating a result to which both have lent a hand. Their æsthetic or logical instinct asks for a consistent scheme, which is ever denied them. Yet this, perhaps, would not signify were the outcome a practical system of life and action in which all could find a place; and, hitherto, it has been no such thing. The arch rises to a certain height and then it begins to crack and shiver; it threatens to fall this way and that way, and needs to be shored up continually with fresh enactments and contrivances, all betokening that the keystone is not yet discovered which shall bind its parts together. That keystone, as religious men believe, never will be made to crown and secure the edifice until a living and divine faith is universally recognized as the prologue, or first article, of the constitution.

But those who have governed Europe for a long generation agree with the anarchists they are vainly attempting to put down,

in their fundamental principle, viz., that religion, if not a dream, is, at any rate, merely a private sentiment, a matter of taste and liking, a humor, an idiosyncrasy, which can as little furnish the preamble of laws or the corner-stone of a polity as any other individual difference. They are defending with all the resources of the arm of flesh wherein they trust, an order of things which the wielders of dynamite aim at shattering in pieces; yet neither the civil authorities nor the disciples of Kropotkin appeal to the divine element in men, but only to his interests as a bourgeois or his despair and rage as an enslaved proletarian. The springs of action which both alike assume—what are they but appetites, and not ideals? On this view, the race is to the swift and the battle to the strong; might becomes right; Mammon reigns supreme; and the purpose of life is an epicurean sum of pleasures misnamed happiness.

It is astonishing how widespread are the ravages of a materialism that deals with both our best and noblest instincts as though they were ingrained delusions. Everywhere the passion for luxury, and the love of money as the chief means of procuring it, find open acknowledgement. All men—nay, all women—it is said, have a price; to be rich implies that you can buy not merely anything but any one, from the prince who leads society to the journalist who was yesterday a socialist orator and who to-day lives in a great house at South Kensington and calls himself a conservative. Marriage is too often a mere bargain, which holds good until one of the partners sells the other or receives compensation for disturbance in the divorce court. Business, pleasure and politics take the form of gambling, which is invariably dishonest when it can escape detection. Literature is prurient, vulgar, unclean, personal, anarchic, and yet, for the most part, dilettante, occupying itself with the sordid or the trivial, but not daring to affirm either a law of righteousness or faith in the world to come. Last of all, religion in the churches of the Reformation has been thrown into a series of dissolving views, where each presents a larger blank surface than the preceding one, and formless clouds usurp the place where figures of distinct outline and life-like features were of old time visible.

Thus every day seems to plunge Europeans deeper into chaos. Social bands are loosening with frightful rapidity; no man can tell what rights, duties or privileges permanently belong to him; and the multitude of prophets do not add to the sum of wisdom. The hurricane blows in succession from every point of the compass, and individuals, bewildered, panic-stricken, or as good as paralyzed, know not which way to turn amid so great and growing a confusion. Moral authority, claimed at once by Herbert Spencer, Car-

lyle, Tolstoi, Ibsen and Professor Huxley, is reduced to the absurd ; and private judgment, were any man robust enough to exercise it, would of necessity triumph when the wisest are springing at one another's throats. Nevertheless, we do not live in the age of robust individualism ; the crowd is more imitative than ever ; and genius, distinction, character—the godlike attributes of man—can with difficulty maintain themselves against a pressure from without which is every day multiplying its deadly force. That sacred solitude, the nurse of thoughts inspired from on high, and of resolves which have changed the face of the world no longer invites the spirit to enter in and dwell there, for children have had their fresh young lives corrupted ere they put off the golden wings of youth. Education does not suffer them to dream, to muse, to find their true selves in the presence of an enchanted nature. They must join in the rush, compete and struggle, be taught the vulgarities in which their parents believe, and never know that they are sacrificing the divinest poetry to a fierce and withering reality, until it is too late, and they have followed a multitude to do evil.

Is it wonderful, then, if the more contemplative, or such as Wordsworth praises, the men whose hearts “beat to the heroic song of ancient days,” on looking around them, are struck with sadness and refuse to take comfort in the spectacle of an ease and wealth which spell “decadence” no less than “democracy?” Their eyes have been purged as with euphrasy and rue ; they see far other things than the multitude, and see them vanishing into the unknown. With the outward framework, the voting-booths, platforms, printing-presses, the railroads and telegraphs, they have no quarrel ; why should they quarrel with means which may be turned to good or bad ? Their disquietude is concerned with the ends which all this great machinery subserves. Will it make man less animal and more human ? Will it lead him on to perfection ? Is it intended to bring out in him the divine character which lies implicit and undeveloped in his heart his mind, his spirit ? Or is it not already robbing him of the excellent things to which, by so long and fearful a *Via Crucis*, he had, in principle at least, attained ? These questions may be touched as with a flaming fire, until they glow with heat and passion ; or the calm philosopher may disguise them in terms of his craft ; and so they shall pass unregarded. But they are the true questions of our time, knocking at many a breast, whispering in the drowsy ear of pleasure and drawing to themselves the anxious interest of many who for themselves desire no good which must be purchased by the evil of their fellows.

The supreme problem is not to lose religion. Now we know well that in order to preserve or restore it, we must view the enterprise in its length and breadth, nor imagine that the brunt of the battle

will be fought inside the walls of a church, in the pulpit, and not among the people themselves. We grant that it was not by preaching any abstract system merely, or, for the most part, that secularism has taken to itself the power it wields. In a thousand ways, by means of art, literature, criticism, by sympathy and association, by carrying its principles into the details of life, and, above all, by a firm faith in them to which its practice corresponded, has this modern religion, which is no religion, come to rule over us. A handful at first, these men and women, from Rousseau to George Eliot, have made disciples by the charm of their writing; by the passion they threw into it; by claiming as their own the larger, grander views of things; by awakening enthusiasm in the young; by a dexterous yet self-deluding employment of the names and watchwords that will always find an echo in human hearts; by insisting that they were in the van of progress, and were marching to the promised land. They have even, shall we dare to say it, turned its own cannon against the Christian host. For how else are we to understand the battle cries of the revolution, its liberty, equality, and fraternity, except as stolen from the Gospel and hurled into the face of a social order which every day rehearsed this creed and every hour was trampling it into the mire? That shameful hypocrisy well deserved the punishment of fire and sword which fell upon it. What must be our feeling at any time when anointed prelates have grown to be indistinguishable from great secular lords, and serve the world instead of the altar? When even a Christophe de Beaumont will not so much as eat with a priest of plebeian birth; or what when we see Christian laymen in the height of luxury, while on every side of them thousands are crying for bread, for light, for a little human consideration at their hands? Once more, shall we be astonished that the stones of the street have a voice put into them, and the roar of the barricades is heard over them, so long as no effectual word of condemnation issues from the sanctuary, although mammon has dethroned Christ, and the rule of the market is confessedly a murderous lust of gain? If religion had made a truce with its old enemy, and the Sermon on the Mount were out of date, "Welcome!" we should not shrink from exclaiming, "welcome the satire and reproaches even of infidels, which might compel us to do homage before our own principles, and to uphold the truths we were forgetting." Positivism will always end in the worship of wealth and pleasure, but its polemics have been thundered against a degenerate Christendom, which flouted the beatitudes and did not believe in them.

The state of things which has continued during the last hundred years, though full of alarm and trouble, is not without pre-

cedent. We may travel back as far as twenty-six centuries ago, and we shall hear the noblest of the Old Testament prophets announcing, not only the law, but the method whereby the Keeper of Israel chastises, in order that He may convert, His people. When the pitiless heathen power of Assyria was marching against Jerusalem, and many oracular persons declared that it was impossible the Lord's house should be laid waste, they were told to see in these idolators and blasphemers the instrument which the Almighty had chosen for His purpose. Since priest and prophet alike were neglecting their high mission; since they prophesied smooth things, and suggested compromises, and sat in the feasts of usurers, and looked on in silence while the heritage of the laboring man went to swell the estates of nobles, what was left, humanly speaking, to rouse them from their guilty sleep except that the lightning should descend out of the cloud and smite the very Temple? All was to be taken away which could bind them to the duties of their office; yet that immense catastrophe wherein they beheld only a ruined kingdom and a covenant destroyed, was, according to the devout interpretation, the new birth of Israel, leading on to a higher and more humane stage of the ideal which it was destined to preserve until Christ should appear.

We, too, shall be stripped of every veil between ourselves and the Gospel, of the network which establishments and prescriptions have woven around us; and in losing much of the past we shall be guided towards the future. But so closely is the Church bound up with an order of things no longer acceptable to the mind of Europe, that in sundering the one from the other agonies like those of death must be endured. Not only so. The assault upon Catholicism has well-nigh brought down civilization to the ground. It is not a small or insignificant party which would sweep away the remembrance of history and antiquity, Greeks and Romans, classic and mediæval, in the spirit of those Nihilists to whom nothing is sacred that was standing yesterday. Hence, on the other hand, many who are conscious of the deep principle contained in the word "Evolution," and who feel with Shakespeare that man is "made and moulded of things past," even while he moves on to the heights beyond him, have been anxiously inquiring whether from the wreck of religion, as they speak, any flotsam or jetsam may still be saved. We do not call it a wreck, in spite of the heartrending statistics of our modern cities; but the question comes home to us, and we ask, in turn, whether, by the general acknowledgment of reformers and revolutionists, there do not exist in the Catholic Church treasures which mankind are in every way bound to preserve, and by the loss of which all would be affected? These, then, we may put forward as the human claims, or the re-

wards and inducements whereby we recommend ourselves to a generation that must be taught the difference between religion and fanaticism, if it is not to pass us by disdainfully to its own lasting hurt.

We begin with what is greatest and has already won a marvellous recognition—we mean the Catholic idea of worship; our ritual, liturgy, and public prayer. Not insisting, for the moment, on those divine realities which, as Catholics maintain, are exhibited and brought down to us by means of these sacred rites, we would point out how men of the most opposite temperaments, and not inclined to judge our political system leniently, have yet concurred in viewing the Catholic forms of worship, and the associations they body forth, as alone adequate, or even adapted, to unite mankind in the presence of the Eternal, as being full of reverence, majesty, and sweetness, no less sublime than they are affecting, at once highly poetical and most impressively real, and at this day unapproachable by deliberate imitation on the part of moderns, though genius should inspire it. The only altar round which the children of Adam will be gathered, if any at all, say these farsighted thinkers, is that on which the sacrifice of the Mass shall be duly lifted up. By the immense void which was left on its abolition, the Catholic Liturgy has proved even to Puritans and Nonconformists how just a claim it possessed on the spirit, as well as the imagination, of our race. To cherish, nay, to preserve the religious life, by preaching within the bare walls from which every token, symbol, and gracious ordinance of the Lord Incarnate had been rudely thrust out, is now seen to be an impossibility. The people are not content with preaching, and they have risen up and flocked into the street rather than endure a deadly formalism which had neither comeliness nor grace to make it winning in their sight. Was it the main purpose of Luther, Knox, and Calvin to set up what they called a spiritual religion, in which the pulpit overshadowed the altar, nay, in which altar and sacrifice were to be thought an abomination? They have made the trial, and it is a disastrous failure. Though the dogmas of the Church be called in question, its high religious symbolism, which, even more than its dogmas, stirred up the bitter wrath of the first Protestants, has subdued their children in spite of themselves. It is finding a welcome in the courts from which it might have seemed forever excluded; and the heart of Christianity is known to be that Apostolic Liturgy of which the fiercest blasphemies were spoken, as we now perceive, in vain.

Let us endeavor to sketch, though in mere outline, the view which this great change is opening before us. Even thoughtful Catholics may be slow to realize how much it implies. First of

all, it is an admission that, unless the religious instinct ceases to exert on human nature the influence allotted to it during thousands of years, it must, for civilized man, take the form of Catholicism. Again, the method of private judgment, by which every one was not only encouraged, but commanded, to set out on a voyage of discovery in search of the true religion, as though it were a problematic country which might, or might not, exist beyond the waves, is now tacitly abandoned. For while disputes concerning speculative theology, or the essentials of the faith, do, by their very nature, continue as long as any two men choose to argue about them, a public liturgy is like the sun in heaven; we need only to open our eyes, and we at once must confess it to be a fact beyond the reach of skepticism. But, in the next place, ritual carries with it the very ideal and reality of the Church, whose living expression, language and worship it has always been. For as no prophecy is of private interpretation, in like manner, no sacrament or sacrifice goes back simply to the individual. The caprice, or fancy, or superstition, the freaks of a restless imagination, the sickly dreams and changeable notions in which a man left to himself will indulge, have nothing in common with so public and fixed a ceremonial—itsself coming down through the ages—which is every one's inheritance, and is at all times as plain to touch and sight as the monuments of Rome or Egypt. By this one stroke the clouds and phantoms of a "subjective" religion which have filled our atmosphere since the Reformation are swept away; we come into contact with a whole range of glorious realities, not demanding at every moment to be proved and proved afresh, lest they melt into thin air, like so many delusions of the visionary. These abide even when we are not thinking of them, and as often as we turn our gaze that way, they meet us in all their clear outline and solid substance. The task, so much beyond our faculties, of each one building up for himself a spiritual realm, and, by a miracle of reason, selecting the right elements amid the chaos round about him, is now taken from off our shoulders. Instead of retreating within ourselves, and from the depths of consciousness evolving a great comprehensive scheme in which God as well as man, and life no less than death and immortality, shall have their due place, we are told to look out, to mark where the Christian altar is erected, and to join in the common rites which, circling through the seasons and embracing every state of humanity from childhood to old age, exhibit and perpetuate all that is most ancient, sacred, solemn and mysterious in the history of the world. What else is this than to reinstate tradition as the vehicle and the guardian of religious faith? Is it not the same thing as relegating mere speculation to the only place it can reasonably

claim (the second, and not the first) distinctly on the ground that a living system, or synthesis, an objective and real organism, never has sprung out of analytic formulas, but must be planted on the rock of history, and is something which we may and ought to take hold of, but ourselves have no power to create? The fact of Christianity is, then, by this remarkable change of view, declared to be identical with Catholicism as an objective system; and they can henceforth no more be divided than by definitive form, the things in which it is realized, and without which it would be an empty sound. "Oh rerum mira conversio," we may well exclaim with Vincent of Lerins. For who could have predicted that in the development of Bible criticism, on the one hand, as of social economics on the other, and yet again, by sheer reaction from the dryness and dreariness of interminable preaching, Europeans would have been brought round again to conceive of the Church as necessarily both real and visible, not, as so many religious liberals and public men have dreamt, a matter of the private conscience only, but much more, a people, a society, even a kingdom, like that Israel from which it is historically descended? If the liturgy is a response to human needs deeply felt, and alone has the power of making those chords vibrate within our hearts, which must else remain forever silent, or discourse mere broken harmonies, it follows that Catholicism will endure, that its function and dignity are assigned to it in the nature of things as they now stand, and that to leave it out of account would be, in the language of Pericles, as though the spring were taken out of the year.

Neither, be it observed, does this argument plead simply for the poetical grace and inspiration which flow from the Catholic ritual. It aims at something far beyond poetry, in the common way of accepting that word; its scope is the spiritual, the divine or transcendental, the secret and the mystery of the highest life, in which He whom we can neither name worthily nor at all comprehend, lifts us up to Himself, and makes us partakers of his own nature. Yet, unlike the Kantian system, which arrives at things eternal (if, indeed, it does so) by means of a postulate, or of that which it absolutely takes for granted, here we set out from experience, and have no need of postulates. The life is given through these sensible media, these sacraments, these sacred rites, when enacted according to tradition and by the appointed ministers. And it is the Christian life which is thus continued from age to age—a character of the most precise and unmistakable type, not, indeed—let us gratefully own it—stamped, as by some hard mechanism, on those in whom it shines forth, but while varying in detail and circumstance, in the beauty of its manifestation displaying a most delicate and ever fresh regard for the individuality of the men and

women whom it fashions into the one likeness. So that we must either rend this garment, as the Reformers strove to rend it—a thing which, we say, has proved impossible—or recognize it as seamless throughout, woven in a simple piece from top to bottom. The liturgy cannot be divorced from the life; and both make known to us a high and holy discipline, of which the sole justification in history has been a dogmatic creed.

We desire to lay the greatest possible emphasis on the method of recommending our faith which is here indicated. There are those who would rest their apologetics almost on a single syllogism, in which the principle of authority is set up against the anarchy of private judgment; and with them, as we need scarcely observe, we are not in the least quarreling as to the soundness of their procedure. But we would venture to remind them of St. Augustine's famous quotation, "*Trahit sua quemque voluptas*," and of his comment thereupon. "*Non necessitas*," the great teacher exclaims; that is to say, not the compulsion of sovereign power, to which we ungraciously yield, "*sed voluptas; non obligatio, sed delectatio: quanto fortius nos dicere debemus, trahi hominem ad Christum, qui delectatur veritate, delectatur beatitudine, delectatur justitia, delectatur sempiterna vita quod totum Christus est?*" The appeal to authority, thus clad in the beauty of holiness, and enforced by "admiration, hope and love," as directed to the person of whom all these touching ceremonies are in remembrance, will surely not lose anything of its logical strength because it has also a charm for those to whom logic seems only an artifice, and legal claims, however well established, a challenge to argument rather than the echo of Christ's persuasive words, "*Venite ad me omnes*." Moreover, in beginning our journey where so many are now gathered together, we may hope to lead certain of them onward; our first steps will be along the paths of peace, and, by the mere course of our exposition, we shall be able to undo that fatal error which alone made the heresies of the Reformation plausible. What was it? you ask us: Surely this, we reply, that first comes speculative or systematic theology, and religion next, as a deduction from it. An error, the consequences of which have spread far and wide, not only among those who would own themselves to be Rationalists, but in society at large, and against which even Catholics are by no means carefully on their guard as the pernicious nature of the infection demands.

To speak in the terms of German philosophy, though employing them for our own purpose, we say that we have run the risk of substituting the analytic or logical faculty, the bare prose understanding, in the place of the religious spirit—assuredly not while celebrating our divine mysteries, but when we aim at bringing others

to share in them. Great and happy exceptions may be named; we rejoice to think so; yet who that recalls the long array of controversial and even devotional works written, for example, during the eighteenth century, and still popular in many circles, will deny that the impression left by such is abstract and dreamy as compared with the living power and the tender grace which are characteristic of the Imitation, the hymns and sequences of Adam of St. Victor, and the lives of mediæval saints, whether hermits, like Felix of Valois, or warriors, like St. Louis, or statesmen, like St. Bernard and Innocent III.? Well, we are endeavoring to bring out the applicability of an old Catholic principle to our present circumstances, and we suggest that argument is one thing and faith another; that, however true it may be, as, of course, it is, that discussion has its uses, still the most convincing evidence for Christianity is not a chain of syllogisms, nor is it even the need, imperative though it be, of a supreme authority in matters of religion. It is, at last, the Divine Life made manifest in our worship, our practice and our teaching in a concrete tangible shape, which shall be commensurate with the intelligence of the people and, if we may venture so to express ourselves, obvious to their senses and delightful or subduing to their imagination.

Let us make allowance for human nature in those whom we address, if not in ourselves, not reducing the credentials we bring with us to one bare and gaunt syllogism, as though some exquisite Greek statue had been suddenly transformed into its own anatomy. Are all logicians? Do all find inexhaustible pleasure in tracing the connection of ideas? or is it wise to show them authority as frowning anathemas on the disobedient ere we have convinced them that its delight is not at all in anathemas, but in keeping watch over the previous things of the gospel transmitted to its charge? If we can make them feel the attraction of which St. Augustine speaks, the rest is easy, "*Da amantem, et sentit quod dico, da desiderantem, da esurientem.*" That is the miracle which no syllogisms could have wrought, and now the number of those that hunger and thirst after life, that have grown weary of rationalizing and the individual fancies which leave them in the wilderness, seems to be growing day by day. Abstract discussion will neither heal nor enlighten them; what they need is Revelation, and this again not as a series of formulas in terms beyond their capacity, but on the plain and simple method which the teaching of the Master suggests, in parable, history and sacrament. How can we prove that it is precisely this, and not any kind of scholasticism, which our generation will find most suitable to the frame of mind in which it has grown up? We turn to the epistles of one who was called to teach their like in his day, and I hear him saying, "But

if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all. And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so, falling down on his face, he will worship God and report that God is in you of a truth." The prophesying which is here described as its own evidence may now be regarded as coextensive with the whole service of the Church and with that affirmative or explanatory preaching—at the very opposite pole from controversial arguments—by means of which an interpretation of the sacred things shown or done is furnished to our people. This we conceive to be the revelation "with power" which St. Paul distinguishes from the "enticing words of man's wisdom" and sets forth as the "demonstration of the Spirit." Not, again we say, that there is no room for the severest processes of reasoning without a particle of sentiment in the schools of Christian theology. My contention, however, is that comparatively few have either the inclination or the gifts which would enable them to rely on such methods when coming to the Church, and that the way of Providence is much more on the level, that power is attached to ordinances, and that these more impressively than the most eloquent of controversial discourses do show forth "the death of the Lord until He come," which is the sum and substance of the message we have been sent to deliver.

It has been repeatedly urged, by such skilled disputants as Joseph De Maistre, Newman and Moehler, that Christianity did not come into the world as an abstract system of philosophy, and that, had it done so, nothing but a miracle would have saved it from the fate which has overtaken other systems. In a few years its place would have known it no more. Is this to deny that principles of the deepest philosophy may be discerned at the foundations of Christendom? Or does it proscribe and forbid intellectual inquiry on the part of those who are qualified to undertake it? By no manner of means. The purpose of all such observations is to open our eyes that we may see the difference between schemes made up of mere formulas and a religion which discourses to the faithful not formulas but objects, and those in their nature heavenly and eternal; or, to put the same truth from another point of view, we are not to imagine that the New Testament has completely broken with the Old, as if, whilst the children of Israel enjoyed a visible communication with their Lord and King, Christians must be satisfied to walk in a path by themselves, every one, indeed, having the Spirit, but no two bearing witness that He dwells in them, nor being permitted to look up to the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night, which was the comfort of those who journeyed with the tabernacle through

the desert. There is a perfect harmony in the dealings of the Almighty from first to last. He does not, like a human teacher, set before us reasonings which we may criticise by counter-reasonings or to which, when it seems good in our eyes, we may yield assent. What He reveals is not a mere philosophy nor a system, but Himself, as He declared at the beginning: "I will be what I will be"—that is to say, by a series of Providences, every one of which makes Him better known, He will form to Himself a chosen people, and will thus, in very deed, become their God.

Even such is the manifestation which He has, in these latter days, made of His glory through and in the Son of Man. It is an objective gift, as well as a subjective acquisition. In weight and length and depth it goes far beyond our understanding; we cannot fathom the abysses of the Divine Mercy, and our faith always holds in it more than we shall be able to reckon. Starting from the purely abstract, how are we to arrive at facts in the concrete? The Catholic way is to begin with the facts, as something given, and to demonstrate their reality by the power which comes forth from them, exactly following the method of nature or the instinct in obedience to which we lay hold of the physical world immediately, without stopping to answer the pyrrhotist who warns us that we may be taking a shadow as substance. Now, if it be true that Christianity so began, we argue that on the same principles it is to continue. The method which brought disciples to our Lord is the method which will bring disciples to His church. Ought we, then, to put metaphysical reasonings in the foreground, to open our attack from the clouds, as it were, and to interpose a wide range of discussion, such as the Christian evidences too commonly have been, in the way of those who desire to know something, not of our philosophy but of the life we have to offer them? Shall we prefer the wisdom of Athens, which could not redeem one city from destruction, to the prophetic and divine power as it is experienced in our mysteries? Of course, we should be distressed at the thought of so profound a disloyalty to our Master. Yet we may have given in, more than we suppose, to the methods of that philosophic school which we undertook to overthrow. For, in controversy, as in a duel, there must needs be an agreement to use the same weapons. And those who have surveyed the scholastic quarrels and intricate terminologies of the fourteenth century will assign to them no small share in producing the decay of faith which set in afterwards.

But now, at length, on both sides the true starting-point is coming to be acknowledged. It is not private judgment ranging at will among Divine truths, picking and choosing, here a little and there a little, as if religion were a patchwork and the Bible an ori-

ental bazaar. No, nor is it the Sacred Volume itself without note or comment; for critical scholarship has made it simply impossible that one man in ten thousand should venture to decide what is and what is not an oracle of Scripture. Nor, in the third place, is it a system of propositions, technical in their wording, abstruse in their significance, and to be proved by an array of long-drawn arguments the like of which may be studied (by those who have abundant leisure) in divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Even when one of these systems happened to embody great cardinal truths, as may be the case with Molinism or the later Thomism, still it does not afford the sure and solid ground on which we must take our stand—it is not religion, but philosophy; it shows us man's thought about God, not God revealing himself to man; Revelation is the starting-point, but that revelation made real, present and effective in a life the centre of which is Divine ordinance, the power of which was long ago summed up in a single word, Emmanuel—"God with us." Before that veiled and awful majesty the systems of mortal man fall silent; there is no word which they can utter in the sanctuary, helpful and seasonable though they may prove outside those sacred gates. For it is the wonderful character of faith to unite gentle and simple, learned and unlearned, in the apprehension of the same Divine Object, each according to his measure, but in a union which the analytic intellect cannot reduce to its own expression. Yet we are by no means suggesting—far from it—that faith is not of the mind as well as of the heart. We hold it to be something spiritual; nor will we consent to deal with the spirit on those modern principles by which it is confounded and lost in a group of sensations or nervous thrills. Our faith is not only rooted in history; it pierces, also through phenomena to their substance, and if even theological science cannot exhaust its contents, the reason is not because faith and feeling are identical, but that science never has been found adequate to the full delineation of personality.

He that divides the letter from the spirit, and looks upon forms—even the most sacred—as an end in themselves, may be termed a Ritualist or Pharisee; while his counterpart (in the style of Plato) is the Rationalist, who sacrifices forms sensible to formulas intellectual, and dissecting the body, banishes the soul which dwelt therein. Neither of them has understood the true quality of life or seen in history by what means the spirit is kept from escaping out of these earthly vessels. Here it is that a right acquaintance with the Bible will guide us straight into the creative secret of the Church. For in the Bible two great powers are seen to be combined, under the head of Providence, towards the final issue, which is Christ abiding as a present Deity among the faith-

ful. These are the priesthood and the prophetic word. May we not regard them as forming together a mysterious sacrament, of which the outward sign was the Aaronic order, but the inward grace prophecy, expressing itself by speech and symbol, and correcting, restraining, enlightening as occasion demanded? The Word was something more than philosophy, and the ordinances, far from being vain or superfluous—though in time to be done away as shadows only of the good things to come—had a virtue in them by which the people of Israel were kept distinct from the heathen. We, likewise, enjoy the “firm prophetic word;” our liturgy is framed almost wholly in the language and coloring proper to it, and that word, again, gives the spirit or sense of all those actions which take place round about our altar. Let it be applied to the phenomena—how complex soever—in which we find ourselves entangled, and we need borrow the wisdom neither of Greek nor German; with its aid we may build up, not empty systems, but a living order of civilization, a code of morals, a philosophy teaching by example, a concrete world that shall be the announcement of the new and heavenly city coming down from above.

Our conclusion is, therefore, that we should aim more and more at making the Catholic Church its own evidence to those without, by showing them what treasures of grace and truth are contained in its ritual, its prophesying, and its spiritual life; in the saints whom it has raised up to minister among the people; in its martyrs of charity and its Christ-like men and women, with their gifts of unwearied zeal and compassion, their tenderness for the suffering, and their immortal and unconquerable hope in God. But likewise to those who are within, many thousands of whom, though they attend its worship and delight in it, do still, as if their eyes were holden, fail to realize which, and how great, are the chief riches of the sanctuary; some fixing their enthusiasm upon passing and ephemeral inventions, luxuries rather than necessities of the heavenly life; others careless of the beautiful things which are their inheritance, and disdaining, not merely the barbarism of past ages but their religious art, their traditions of hieratic decorum, their contemplative spirit, as though we could preserve the central rites of Christianity, while refusing to share in the thoughts and feelings of those to whom we are indebted for them.

If Chateaubriand could say, ninety years ago, that controversy must change its method in order to persuade a new generation, and instead of proving our religion to be admirable because it comes from God, must rather show that it comes from God because it is admirable, he did not mean, nor do we, that Christians should practice a vulgar eclecticism, snatching at the fancies of the day

and endeavoring to outbid revolutionaries or secularists in their own auction. His counsel was that men should be persuaded to look at the reality instead of arguing about it, a reality which in its nature is the greatest of historical facts, and not merely one set of opinions among many. Let us prove, he said, that of all the religions which have ever been known, Christianity—and with Novalis we subjoin that Catholicism is nothing else than Christianity made concrete—that this religion is the most poetical and humane, the most encouraging to liberty, the arts, and literature; that our modern world owes everything to it, from the culture of its fields to the abstract sciences, from hospitals for the suffering to the lofty temples designed by Michael Angelo and adorned by Raffaele. We must show, as we readily can, how sublime is its moral discipline, how high and yet attractive its spiritual truths; we must urge upon men, with the page of history to warrant us, that Catholicism has fostered genius, given a manly vigor to the mind, awakened the passion of philanthropy, suggested noble forms to the poet, and inspired the artist; that while it has ever upheld the principle of order and recognized in lawful authority the very voice of God, it may justly claim to have spread throughout the world a free democracy, in which the children of the lowliest might rise by their merit to the chair of St. Peter, and women like St. Catharine of Siena, St. Theresa, and St. Gertrude might exercise, though not a priestly yet a prophetic office, while their less gifted sisters became ministering angels to the sick, the poor, the afflicted, and the forsaken. Nor is it a slight argument to point out that where the Catholic Church has been exiled the arts and the charities have taken flight in her train. The force of the contrast is, indeed, overpowering when we set the dismal centuries of Protestantism in the light of the Catholic civilization, with its feeling for all that is beautiful, heroic, and supernatural. That divine sanctuary which we have called the heart of our religion, when it broadened out and its boundaries took in the peoples of Europe, contained, as in some luminous and unfallen world, cities, temples, monasteries, sweet silent solitudes, and busy marts, and homes of peace, and everywhere displayed the riches of an inspiring and inspired existence. Its breath was poetry; its spirit was self-denial; its hope was in the Eternal.

How is all that changed as we look on the armed and industrial slavery which sums up the tale of modern life! When the holy place was desecrated and the altar overthrown, speedily the wilderness, which had been cleared, began to conquer again. We have to deal with an immense and fast-growing population before whose eyes no spiritual vision is unfolded—to which the true human and Christian motives of conduct are as strange as if they

had never been preached—heathens that do not worship even the gods of Paganism, and who have scarcely a suspicion that man was meant for something better than to gratify his appetites or to sell himself in the labor market. What is our message to them? We must take them with the cords of Adam, by multiplying in the midst of them that presence of Christ which they have not known; and we must claim for them, on our own principles, whatever is lovely, noble, and elevating in art or nature, drawing all things which are not utterly doomed to perish into the circle of His blessing. How this was accomplished by our forefathers we may learn if we do but contemplate the churches they set up; the ceremonies they have bequeathed to us; their painting, writing, and architecture; the religious orders, with their severe yet beneficent institutions; and all that is truly characteristic of such creative minds as St. Benedict, St. Gregory VII., and St. Francis of Assisi. The splendid and touching poetry of Dante will let us into the secret which kindled their genius, while in Shakespeare we view, as in a clear fresco, the more wordly aspects of mediæval greatness; and how astonishing it is that they could unite such depths of mystery with a quick-feeling, romantic, and gay, yet turbulent, existence. The truth is, that religion intensified their emotions as it enlarged their being. A pulse of immortality was beating in these mortal veins, and faith had already begun to chant the divine epithalamium, or marriage song, of heaven and earth.

Our situation is different, nor so promising. For the Church in Europe has now to defend what remains erect rather than she is permitted to carry out her own design of establishing God's law in righteousness. And defence is well known to be far more difficult than to assail, or even, I will add, to create from the beginning.

In America, where the mediæval order has never existed, the task of Catholicism should be more hopeful because the ground is comparatively clear. But east or west of the Atlantic it will always be true that the Church is the centre of the ages, the link between times past and times to come; not so ancient that she cannot adapt herself to altered circumstances, nor so forgetful of her origin as to descend from her place and be lost in the crowd of modern innovators. If, on looking back over her long history, we observe that Origen, and Clement of Alexandria, and Augustine wrote under Platonic inspiration; that the schoolmen were indebted to the Arabians; that to St. Thomas Aquinas the Greek Aristotle is the master of those that know; or again, that the Renaissance, despite its serious moral shortcomings and heathen temper, was treated more than indulgently by austere saints who

venerated Savonarola yet did not share in his iconoclastic zeal, we can still discern, amid so much variety, a sameness of texture, and an overruling spirit, and an essence unchangeable, in virtue of which Catholicism never was simply an echo of Plato, Aristotle, or the Humanists, but something always at one with itself, distinct, and supernatural. What an energy, what a life, must have existed within her not to be transmuted and altogether dissolved by such potent influences, some of which her wisest teachers withstood on this very ground that their triumph would be almost her extinction? Yet she was able to absorb, to assimilate, and even to turn them, as in the case of the Hellenic poets and philosophers, to her own advantage. A lesson, surely, for us who are called upon to handle the multifarious products of the world in our day. But we shall not succeed as our fathers did unless we take the course laid down by them, not being led away as if disciples of new philosophies, or specious literatures, or aspiring economic systems, but criticizing all these on the standard furnished to us in the creed of which we make daily confession. Neither ought we so far to misread our own principles as, even for the sake of controversial victory, to invert the divine order of things, whether by attributing to mere abstract arguments a grace that attends on the prophetic word, or by losing sight in our disputations of the concrete ordinances which, rather than systems of technical reasoning, are our strength and our attraction. "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" is the teaching of the Evangelist. If, at any time, instead of that most human and loving figure, we invite men to contemplate the "*idola theatri*" of our own devising, notions and schemes, or theories or philosophies, deduced, by some subtle sleight of hand, from the New Testament, but still not the Gospel in its living traditional form, let us not be amazed though men, who are satiated with the reformers' wordy battles, decline to make a second experiment in the same kind. We must begin with facts if we would end with faith. Even the truest analytic philosophy, though it be sound as far as it goes, never did more than predispose some to hope that Christianity might be credible. To believe, they must be brought face to face with its Supreme Object.

WILLIAM BARRY.

Scientific Chronicle.

ESSENTIAL OILS.

MANUFACTURE—PROPERTIES--USES.

IN the October number of this REVIEW we gave some account of the more important true (fixed or fatty) oils. We saw that they are mixtures of a set of well-defined chemical compounds of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, and that, from their very composition, they can be readily distinguished from all other substances. This is not the case with the essential oils. Among these a great many are pure hydrocarbons, *i.e.*, compounds of hydrogen and carbon only; others contain oxygen in addition, others again sulphur, and a few nitrogen. Nor are they built up on any special plan that we can clearly recognize. Of course, each oil is a definite chemical compound, or at least a mixture of such compounds, but an inspection of the formula will fail to lead us to a definition, and without that we can hardly hope to be happy. Moreover, we find among these oils, as in some other cases of chemical compounds, the curious phenomenon of isomerism, that is, cases in which bodies are made up of the same elements in the same proportions, and which nevertheless differ very widely from each other in their physical, and even in their chemical properties. When we fall in with these cases, we say that the arrangement of the atoms in the molecule must be different, just as, in an analogous way, from the same number of bricks, and blocks of granite or marble, of the same size, we may, by varying the grouping, build a church, or a palace, a mausoleum, a fort, or a mill-dam, etc. This phenomenon of isomerism gives us but little trouble, but in the matter of defining the term "essential oil," it must be sorrowfully confessed that the chemists have so far left us in a pretty bad muddle. No clear definition has as yet been concocted; and even classification, which is needed as a stepping-stone to a definition, would seem rather less satisfactory than the order of the indiscriminate rubbish of a garret, or of the odds and ends in a forty-year-old junk shop.

Why then do we call them "oils" at all: It is surely not because they *are* oils, for they are *not*, but because our venerated ancestors called them so in ages past, and "a name lives on forever." But this does not teach us how to recognize them. It does not tell us how to put our index-finger *here* and say: "This substance is an essential oil;" or *there* and say: "This other one is not." It is true that they have some properties in common, some links to bind them together, but these do not always seem to divide them sharply from certain other substances which are not essential oils, nor group them clearly under any one head. You may search the standard lexicons, the encyclopædias, the larger works on chemistry, and even the *ex professo* treatises on oils, and yet you will

probably end in a mist. You will find in one place, as a negative characteristic, that they are neither acid nor alkaline. True, but that does not distinguish them from the alcohols and ethers, and many other neutral bodies, not the least important among which is water. In another place it will be stated that they do not saponify, or form soaps with the alkalis. True again, but neither do a great many other bodies, molasses for example, and Jamaica Rum. Again, we are told that they are not unctuous to the touch: but neither is chalk nor sandpaper. Turning to positive characteristics, the first one given is, that essential oils are all volatile, that is, at a proper temperature, they pass from the solid or liquid to the gaseous condition. Here again we are brought up with a jerk, for many other substances are equally volatile, as iodine, sulphur, mercury, etc. The next is that they have strong odors. Verily, they often have; but so have other things which no one, chemist or otherwise, would ever dream of calling essential oils, such things, for example, as chlorine, bromine, and sulphuretted and phosphoretted hydrogen. A third is that they are highly inflammable. So are carbon disulphide, and nitro-glycerine, and gunpowder. A fourth that their flame is densely smoky. So is that of paper, hay, sawdust, and the like.

We have given these characteristics of the essential oils in this apparently unfair way, precisely because we have never found them all together in any one work. Some authors give one or two, some give another one or two, but it is evident from what has been said just above, that this is not sufficient. Let us then sum it all up, and say that an essential oil is a body which possesses *all* of these characteristics, positive as well as negative, and not merely a part of them chosen at random. The thing to be done then is to go at the business by a process of elimination. Thus, an essential oil must be:

1. *Volatile*.—This throws out nitro-glycerine, gunpowder, terra cotta, cabbages, and a whole world of other things besides.

2. *Strongly odorous*.—This eliminates from the list, water, carbonic dioxide, etc.

3. *A compound body*.—By this condition, all the elementary substances however odorous or volatile they may be, are left out.

4. *Inflammable and burn with a smoky flame*. This rids us of alcohol, ether, carbon disulphide, and the like.

5. *Neutral*.—Hence, ammonia and all the acids, however volatile or odorous they may chance to be, are barred out.

6. *Non-saponifiable, and not unctuous to the touch*. This shuts off all the true oils and fats, soapstone and plumbago.

If we have not gotten *over* the difficulty, we may perhaps modestly claim to have gotten *around* it. By combining these six points, we may perhaps come to the not unwise conclusion, that an essential oil is something that cannot be classed as anything else, a sort of a chemical tramp, as it were, that is refused admission everywhere, but yet whose existence cannot be ignored. To the one who prides himself on being always rigidly logical and exact, this may not be highly satisfactory, but for the present it seems to be about the best that can be done.

It must not be understood, however, that there is any dispute in practice, about the fact that such and such bodies will invariably be called "essential oils" by everybody, while such and such others will not, even though the *why* of the thing be as elusive as a freshly-caught eel, or the smile on the face of a village clock. They constitute an extensive and very important class of substances without which this world would, in some respects, be a dull and sorry world. The perfumes of all our plants and flowers, as well as of all animal substances, the aromas of all our spices, balsams, resins, and fragrant gums, the savor of all our condiments, the flavor of all our cordials and liqueurs, the bouquet of all our wines, whether from the grape or from other fruits, the special savor, or taste, which serves to distinguish one distilled liquor from another, as in rum, brandy, gin, whiskey, and whatever others there may be, and from whatever sources they may be derived, are all due to the different kinds of essential oils which either exist as such in the fruit or grain, or are developed in the process of manufacture. But the rôle of the essential oils does not end with the mere ornamental fringes of life and its pleasures, for they are useful, necessary even, in more than one of the arts and industries. They are needed in the manufacture of paints, varnishes and lacquers. And what would we do without lacquers and varnishes to preserve our metal and wood work, and paint, to cover up our bad carpentering? Many of these oils are also extensively and successfully used in the practice of medicine.

They are called "essential oils," or "essences," because they possess, in a concentrated form, the peculiar virtues of the substances from which they are extracted. They are called "volatile oils" for the reason already given. "Distilled oils," because they may be obtained by distillation. And "spirits" . . . well . . . perhaps because "now you've got 'em, and now again you haven't."

ORIGIN OF ESSENTIAL OILS.

The inorganic world furnishes us with but one essential oil, viz., petroleum, called also rock oil and mineral oil; but even that, doubtlessly, came originally from the vegetable kingdom, just as our mineral coal did. The subject of petroleum would be too long to handle here.

The animal kingdom supplies us with a few substances whose peculiar odors are ascribed to essential oils, though these have never yet been isolated. We shall say a few words about them a little later on. By far the larger part of the essential oils are obtained from the vegetable kingdom. They exist in a vast number of plants, and occur sometimes in one part of the plant, sometimes in another, and sometimes in several parts of the plant at the same time. Thus, in the rose, the violet, and several others, the essential oil is found only in the flowers; in the nutmeg it is in the fruit; in the clove, it is in the unexpanded bud; in the cinnamon we find three distinct oils, one in the leaves, one in the bark, and one in the root; the orange furnishes two, one from the flowers, the other from the rind of the fruit; in the geranium, the oil

is principally in the leaves; both the leaves and the stems of the peppermint and the pennyroyal contain an oil; in the ginger, it is mostly in the root; in the cedar, the sandal, and some other woods, it saturates the whole tree.

The oils are generally enclosed in special cells, or cavities, or glands, which are sometimes visible to the unaided eye, as in the leaves of the mint and the rind of the orange. At times they lead a monastic life, all alone, but frequently they contain resins in solution; and in that case the mixture, if liquid, is called an "oleo-resin"; if semi-liquid, a "balsam"; if solid, simply a "resin." In a few cases the oil is not actually present in the plant itself, but is produced by the mutual action of inodorous substances when these are brought together in the presence of water. An example of this is the essential oil of bitter almonds, and probably also that of mustard. Essential oils are rarely soluble to any marked degree in water, but they dissolve readily in alcohol, ether, chloroform, fatty oils, and mineral oil. They mix in all proportions with one another.

EXTRACTION OF ESSENTIAL OILS.

In order to extract the essential oils easily and thoroughly, it is often necessary to put the raw materials through a previous preparation. It is evident that different methods will have to be employed for this end, according to the nature and condition of those materials. If the material be wood, it must be comminuted sufficiently to allow the oil to escape; and though at times it will suffice to have it in the form of shavings, yet it is always better, and, in the case of the harder woods, it is absolutely necessary to get it into the form of sawdust. An attempt to accomplish this by actual hand-sawing, or even by machine-sawing, would clearly prove unsatisfactory. A practical method is to use a fast-revolving, hardened, steel drum, whose surface is a rasp. Against this the wood is pressed, and . . . "whiz" . . . the work is done. To prevent clogging, a slender stream of water is made to play over the surface of the drum.

Roots and woody herbs are passed through a machine resembling in principle the hay-cutter. Nuts, barks, hard seeds, etc., are crushed between rollers, either fluted or smooth, according to circumstances. Flowers need no preparation.

Another important point is the properties of the oils themselves. Thus, an orange-peel will retain the quality of its oil unimpaired, and lose very little in quantity, even when shrivelled up and leathery. Rose leaves, dried in the air, retain a portion at least of their odor for years; but the delicate fragrance of the violet is gone before the leaves are completely wilted; while the water-lily loses its pleasant odor, and acquires an extremely unpleasant one, in the course of a few hours. If the odor is persistent in quantity and quality, we need not be in a hurry, but, to catch the "fleeting breath of the violet," we have no time to lose. For oils of this class, the manufactory must be in the midst of the garden itself. They manage it just so in those parts where

this business is most extensively carried on, as at Grasse, Cannes, and Nice, in France, and at Monaco, in Italy. In these places the plants have been brought to the highest state of perfection, and many hundreds of acres of the best soils are under cultivation for the sole purpose of supplying flowers for the manufacture of volatile oils. In the United States the principal oils produced are those of lavender, peppermint, sassafras, winter-green, and birch, though there seems to be no good reason why many others should not be added to the list.

PROCESSES OF EXTRACTION.

There are five distinct methods in use for the extraction of the essences of plants, viz. :

1. Expression, either by hand or by machinery.
2. Distillation.
3. Solution.
 - (a) With the aid of heat, but without pressure.
 - (b) With the aid of pressure, but without heat.
4. Maceration.
5. Absorption.
 - (a) In the cold.
 - (b) With the help of hot air, or other gas.

Frequently a combination of two or more of these processes is necessary in order to reach the desired result.

I. PROCESS OF EXPRESSION.

This method is available only when the substances are especially rich in oil and of sufficient softness, as is the case with the rind of the orange, the lemon, the citron, etc. On a small scale the work is done by hand. Two hand processes are thus described by Dr. Hanbury :

"The workman first cuts off the peel in three longitudinal slices, leaving the central pulp of a three-cornered shape with a little peel at either end. This central pulp he cuts transversely in the middle, throwing it on one side and the pieces of peel on the other. The latter are allowed to remain till the next day and are then treated thus: The workman, seated, holds in the palm of his left hand a flattish piece of sponge, wrapping it round his forefinger. With the other he places on the sponge one of the slices of peel, the outer surface downwards, and then presses the zest-side (which is uppermost) so as to give it for the moment a convex instead of a concave form. The vesicles are thus ruptured, and the oil which issues from them is received in the sponge with which they are in contact. Four or five squeezes are all the workman gives to each slice of peel, which done he throws it aside. Though each bit of peel has attached to it a small portion of pulp, the workman contrives to avoid pressing the latter. As the sponge gets saturated the workman wrings it forcibly, receiving its contents in a coarse earthen bowl which is capable of holding at least three pints. In this rude vessel the oil separates from the watery liquid which accompanies it and is then decanted.

"The yield is stated to be very variable. Four hundred fruits affording nine to fourteen ounces of essence. The prisms of pulp and the exhausted pieces of peel are submitted to pressure in order to extract from them lemon juice, and are said to be also subjected to distillation. The foregoing is termed the *sponge process*; it is also applied to the orange. It appears rude and wasteful, but when honestly performed it yields an excellent product.

"Essence of lemon is prepared at Mentone and Nice by a different method. The object being to set free the oil contained in the vesicles of the peel, an apparatus is employed which may be thus described: A stout saucer or shallow basin of pewter about $8\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter, with a lip on one side for convenience in pouring. Fixed in the bottom of this saucer are a number of stout, sharp brass pins, standing up about half an inch; the centre of the bottom is deepened into a tube about an inch in diameter and five inches in length, closed at its lower end. This vessel has, therefore, some resemblance to a shallow, dish-shaped funnel, the tube of which is closed below.

"The workman takes a lemon in the hand and rubs it over the sharp pins, turning it round so that the oil vessels of the entire surface may be punctured. The essential oil which is thus liberated is received in the saucer, whence it flows down the tube, and as this latter becomes filled it is poured into another vessel that it may separate from the turbid aqueous liquid that accompanies it. It is finally filtered and is then known as *essence de citron au zeste*."

When large quantities are to be dealt with the fruit is first peeled by hand, and the pulp, which contains no oil, is reserved for other purposes. The peels are then tied up in linen or haircloth bags and subjected to the action of a screw-press, in an iron vessel having a perforated bottom. On a really large scale, and especially when it is thought worth while to exhaust the peel completely, hydraulic pressure must be used. The turbid, milky fluid so obtained consists of volatile oil, water holding extractive substances and salts in solution, and finally divided cell substance which was forced through the meshes of the cloth. This seemingly unpromising mixture is allowed to stand in tall, narrow glass jars for several days, at the end of which time it is found to have separated into three distinct layers. The lowest is a slimy deposit of cell substance, the next a clear layer of the aqueous solution of extractive matters, salts and vegetable albumen. The third is the layer of oil, which, being the lightest, floats on the top. A lateral neck with a stop-cock near the bottom of the jar affords the means of drawing off, first, the sediment and watery fluid and afterwards the oil; but the end is not yet. The oil still contains impurities in the shape of vegetable fibres too minute to be seen even with the aid of a good lens, but yet capable of imparting a slight opalescence to the fluid. If this solid vegetable matter were allowed to remain, it would, by decomposing, soon ruin the odor of the oil. Its removal is effected either by filtration or by distillation.

These essences being often so sensitive that prolonged contact with

the air is injurious, special precautions in the process of filtering must be taken to prevent such contact as much as possible. For this purpose the bottle into which the oil is to be filtered is provided with a cork having two holes. In one of these the neck of the funnel fits; in the other a short piece of glass tubing. On the top of the funnel, whose upper rim is ground true, a cover is fitted air-tight by means of a rubber ring. Through the cover passes another piece of glass tubing, which is to be connected with the one in the cork by a rubber tube of convenient length. The filter paper and a charge of oil having been placed in the funnel, the cover is adjusted and the filtering begins. The only air which can now come in contact with the oil is what is contained in the bottle and funnel, and its virtue for mischief is soon exhausted. The books tell us that the cover must not be lifted except for the purpose of pouring more oil into the funnel. We think we can suggest an improvement here. Thus: Provide a second funnel having a stop-cock in its neck and fit it air-tight into the cover of the first. When it is time to replenish the lower funnel, fill the upper one with oil, open its stop-cock and slip off one end of the rubber tube and the oil will descend and fill the lower funnel. Then close the stop-cock and replace the rubber tube, and instead of a fresh quantity of air having been admitted, a part of what was in will have been expelled and the filtering will be continuous as long as oil and bottles hold out. Patent not applied for. After the oil has been carefully filtered, it is stored in well-stoppered bottles, in a cool, dark place. When, for the complete purification of an expressed oil, it is preferred to have recourse to distillation, the oil is mixed with a little water and transferred to a "still," as described below.

2. PROCESS OF DISTILLATION.

Perhaps we ought to take it for granted that everybody knows what is meant by a "still," and yet this article would be incomplete without a few words at least of description. A still consists essentially of two parts, the "body" and the "worm," or "condenser." In the first the substance to be distilled is brought, by means of heat, to the gaseous state, while in the other it is re-condensed to the liquid, and in some few instances to the solid form.

The first part of the operation is effected either by the direct application of fire to the body of the still, or indirectly by means of pipes through which steam is made to pass, or, again, by causing live steam under considerable pressure, say from 50 to 100 pounds per square inch, to pass directly into the body of the still itself and so through the substances contained therein. By this last means any volatile matter in the substances operated on will be taken up and carried along by the steam in its course. In the case of the essential oils, the use of a direct fire is not to be recommended, as it tends to impart to them a burnt or scorched odor. If there is question merely of purifying an oil which has already been extracted by "expression" or otherwise, then the indirect method, of heating the still by steam, is the one to be preferred.

The *rationale* of the purification is in this, that the oil is volatilized and so passes into the "condenser," while the solid impurities remain behind in the water. In fact, the water was added precisely to allow the solid matters a place in which to settle without getting scorched. If the temperature be kept below 212° F., very little, if any, of the water will pass over. Purification by distilling is, in general, called "*rectification*."

But if, on the other hand, there is question of extracting the volatile principles from the plants themselves, then the sending of a current of steam through the substances to be operated upon has the advantage. To accomplish this a perforated false-bottom is fitted inside the body of the still; on this the comminuted substance is placed, and the steam is made to enter below and pass up through the mass till the latter is completely exhausted. A neat contrivance for work on a small scale is to have a still with two bodies, one above the other, with only a narrow opening between them, and then use the lower one as a boiler, while the upper one serves as the "still" proper.

The second part of the operation, the condensation of the volatilized oil, is brought about by causing the oil to pass through a suitable length of tubing, cooled down below the liquifying temperature of the oil. This tubing is kept cool by being encased in a vessel in which cold water, the colder the better, is kept constantly flowing. When a long condensing tube is required it is coiled around, for the sake of compactness, in the form of an open helix, and is then called the "worm." The condensing tube should not be of iron on account of the rust which would be formed and carried along, thus producing discoloration of the oil; but copper and pure block-tin and, for small operations, glass are eminently suitable.

Of course, the steam, as well as the oil, is re-condensed, but the two liquids will usually separate, on standing, into distinct layers in the collecting vessel, and can be drawn off successively. The layer of water will, however, always contain a little of the oil in solution. But this water need not be lost, for it may be used for the rectification of other oils of the same kind, or it may be generously donated to friends or to "hangers-on." Many other points, useful and necessary to the manufacturer, might be touched on here, but we think we have said enough for the edification of those who are not in the business.

3. PROCESS OF SOLUTION.

(a) With the aid of heat but without pressure.

The volatile oils, though but slightly soluble in water, are usually quite soluble in ether, chloroform, carbon-disulphide, petroleum ether, alcohol, etc. In principle the process of solution is simple enough. The raw materials are given a long warm-bath, or soaking, in one or other of the foregoing solvents, by which means their oil is dissolved out and remains in the solvent. The fluid so obtained is then distilled at a very moderate heat; the solvent, passing over first, is re-condensed and saved to be used again, while the essential oil remains behind in the still.

This oil is, however, far from being pure, containing, as it does, dissolved resins, extractive matters, and coloring substances. For rectification a little water is added to the oil in the still, and the temperature is raised till the oil goes over, when it is re-condensed and collected, just as already described under the head of "Distillation."

In the employment of this process very great care must be exercised to guard against fire. The vapors of most of the solvents are heavier than air, and hence are not readily dissipated, but tend to collect around the apparatus. As they are extremely inflammable, no fire nor naked light of any kind should be allowed to come near the still.

(b) With the assistance of pressure, but without heat.

With increased pressure the essential oils can be extracted even at ordinary temperature, by means of one or other of the solvents mentioned above. The extracting vessel is set up in the lower story of the building. It must be made of stout metal, and be carefully put together. It is provided with a perforated false bottom, on which a proper quantity of the raw material is loosely spread. In the centre of the true bottom a tube and stop-cock is fixed. The vessel is provided with a conical cover, which can be firmly clamped in place. A metal tube, that can be uncoupled at will, rises from the centre of the cover through the building, to a height of at least forty feet, where it ends in a funnel-shaped top. (Some people seem to have been rashly thrust into this world without a proper *quantum* of mechanical instinct. If that vertical pipe were made to enter through the side of the vessel, near the top, the pressure would be just as great as in the other way, and the cover could be taken off, and replaced again, without disturbing the pipe, and without running the risk of starting any leaks.) By means of the funnel, the apparatus is filled to the very top. The pressure exerted by a column of liquid of a given height, will vary according to the density of the liquid; from fifteen to twenty-five pounds per square inch being the usual amount, though a greater pressure would work more rapidly. The effect of the pressure is to force the oil from the oil-cells, and at the same time cause it to be absorbed more rapidly and more completely by the solvent. Having been allowed to stand for a sufficient time, generally from a half-hour to an hour, the solution is drawn off by the stop-cock at the bottom, and rectified as described above.

4. PROCESS OF MACERATION.

This process is employed when the essences are too delicate to stand the heat of distillation. The fixed oils and fats have a great affinity for the essential oils, and the method by which advantage is taken of this property is called "maceration." In practice it is conducted as follows: A convenient quantity of fat is placed in a shallow porcelain, or enamelled-iron pan, over a water-bath. The heat under the bath must be so regulated that the temperature of the fat shall not rise much above its melting-point. Freshly gathered flowers are thrown into the melted fat, and well stirred from time to time for a day or two. The exhausted leaves are then strained out, and fresh ones added, and this process is

repeated from ten to fifteen times, until the fat is well saturated with the volatile oil of the flowers. The resulting product goes by the name of "pomade," the uses of which are well known to our readers.

If, however, the oil itself be wanted, it is extracted from the pomade by strong alcohol, which dissolves the oil, but does not take up the fat. The decanted solution may be distilled without heating by the help of a vacuum pump, the essential oil, which is less volatile than the alcohol, remaining in the still. Frequently, however, the alcoholic solution is sold as a perfume under the name of "extract," and is considered perfectly satisfactory, except, perhaps, to the regularly-trained nose of the professional perfumer.

The fixed oils are used in the same way as the fats for the extraction of the essential oils, except that no heat is required to keep them liquid. The celebrated *Huiles Antiques* are merely solutions of essences in pure olive oil. They cannot be used, however, on fabrics, as handkerchiefs for example, because, after the volatile oil has evaporated, the fixed oil remains as a grease spot.

5. PROCESS OF ABSORPTION.

(a) In the cold.

The odor of some flowers, such as the *acacia*, the *jasmine*, the *tuberose*, etc., is so delicate that even the moderate degree of heat used in the preceding process would injure, if not entirely ruin it; and under these circumstances, we must have recourse to the cold-absorption process. The original French method, rather crude indeed, but still in use to some extent, is carried out as follows: Boxes two feet wide, by three feet in length, and three inches deep, are made with wooden sides and loose, glass bottoms. On the glass is spread a thin layer of purified grease, and on the grease a layer of flowers. The boxes are then piled on one another in stacks of a convenient height, and are left undisturbed for two or three days, or until the leaves have lost all their aroma. They are then removed, and fresh ones are supplied in their stead. This operation is repeated as long as there are flowers in bloom; even if it takes all summer. If a fixed oil is to be used for the extraction, then the bottoms of the boxes are made of linen instead of glass, upon which are laid coarse cloths saturated with the oil. At the end of the season these are subjected to strong pressure, and the resulting "extract" is bottled for use. Some firms keep three or four thousand of these boxes in operation during the entire flower season.

It will be readily perceived that this process is exceedingly slow and tedious, and that a good deal of the fat or oil must adhere to the exhausted leaves and be lost, or be recovered only at the cost of considerable time and labor. Besides, it seems that the fat which has been in direct contact with the leaves, is liable to become easily rancid. Hence, other methods have been tried, one of the best of which (possibly it is the very best), we shall attempt to describe.

A box, say two feet square and six feet high, is built in such a way that two of its opposite sides can be opened and closed as doors, and when

closed they are perfectly air-tight. The other two sides, together with the top and bottom, form a fixed frame-work. From each of the fixed sides shelves, occupying the full space from door to door, but about an inch short in the other direction, project alternately, one from the right, the next from the left side of the box, and so on through the whole height. The space between the shelves should be as small as possible, consistently with convenience of manipulation. On one of the shelves are laid plates of glass, covered with a thin layer of grease. A tube projects through one side of the box, above the top shelf, and another, in like manner, below the bottom shelf. It is evident, from the construction described, that any gas or vapor which is forced through one of these tubes can only find exit through the other, and that to do so it must pass over the surface of the grease on every pane of glass in the whole box. This box is named the "Collector."

The next part of the apparatus, the "Extractor," consists of a cylinder of sheet-iron with a tight-fitting lid, about two feet in diameter and four feet high. A tube is inserted in one side near the top, and one in the opposite side near the bottom; the top one is connected with one of the tubes of the collector.

The extractor is loosely filled with flowers, and a slow current of air is driven up through them by suitable mechanism, and thence onward through the collector. The air takes up the volatile oil from the flowers and carries it over the surface of the fat, by which it is absorbed and retained. Unfortunately the oxygen of the air oxidizes a part of the essential oil and renders that part odorless, and as the air is constantly renewed the loss is continuous; besides which, the oxygen is liable to make the fat rancid. A better plan, therefore, has been suggested, and that is, to use some inert gas, such as carbonic dioxide, which can be easily and cheaply prepared, which injures neither the perfume nor the fat, and which can, after it has performed its work, be collected and used over and over again. It is, therefore, merely a "carrier," and, just like an expressman, never breaks the baggage. We think that a slight improvement might be introduced into this process. Instead of throwing the flowers directly into the extractor and being obliged to fish them out again after they have been exhausted, we would suggest that a number of shallow, circular, wire-baskets be made of such a size as to slide easily into the cylinder of the extractor, and about three inches deep. Each basket should have a hole through the centre of its bottom, and around the hole a boss or collar, whose height is equal to the depth of the basket. An iron rod of the same length as the cylinder, and carrying a large nut on its lower end, will serve as an axis on which to string the baskets. These are placed on the axis and filled as they are put in position, one by one, the collars hindering the weight of one basket from compressing the flowers in the one below it. When the pile is complete it may be lifted by the rod directly into the extractor, and when the leaves have been exhausted it can be lifted out and replaced by another, which has been prepared in the meantime and is pensively waiting its turn. By this means one man, or a manly boy,

could keep the machine a-going without loss of time, and, besides, the flowers would be more loosely and more evenly distributed, and thus be better hindered from clogging.

The grease when thoroughly impregnated with the volatile oil may be used as pomade, or as the starting-point for the preparation of extracts or of the pure oils.

(*b*) With the aid of hot air.

"Time is money," says the adage, and therefore whatever saves time in a manufacturing operation is capable of saving money. Now this last process is intended especially for rapid work.

Take an open, iron vessel—call it a pot—and as such set it up properly in a brick furnace. In the pot lay a coil of several turns of metal pipe, both ends of which are to project above and beyond the brim. Fill the pot nearly full with water, and keep it a-boiling. By means of a small pump cause a current of air or, better, carbonic dioxide, to pass through the coil, and regulate the velocity of the current so that it shall pass out at a temperature of about 150° F. If this air or gas were to be sent directly through the flowers it would soon dry them up, a proceeding to which they would so strongly object that, instead of giving up their oils readily, they would hold to them all the faster. Some authorities, therefore, instruct us to pass this hot current into a "Moistener," which is merely a sheet-iron box containing large sponges that are kept constantly wet. This looks like a clumsy contrivance. The sponges are a totally unnecessary nuisance, and will overdo their work by gathering slime and rot. Instead of using sponges partly fill the moistener, which need not be very large, with water. On the outside attach a gauge, such as is used to show the level of the water in a steam boiler, and have a supply of water connected with the moistener, so that the loss from evaporation may be supplied by simply opening a stop-cock. Then run the hot current down under the water, and in bubbling up through, it will heat the water up to its own temperature, and will, at the same time, take up all the moisture it needs to keep the flowers from drying. For greater control over the temperature a good thermometer should be installed in the head of the moistener. If the temperature rises too high urge the air-blast a little; if it falls too low slacken it some. The warm, moist air is next passed into the extractor, where it comes in contact with the leaves, and soon robs them of their volatile oils. These are thence carried forward and absorbed by some suitable solvent, from which they are obtained pure by methods already described. The great advantage of the use of hot air or gas is that it greatly reduces the time necessary for the work, so much so that instead of days, or perhaps even weeks, a few hours will suffice to obtain the oils in a perfectly pure condition. We think that enough has been said to give a fairly-good, general idea of the methods employed for the extraction of the essential oils.

ANIMAL PERFUMES.

Before speaking of the vegetable oils in detail we shall redeem our promise of saying a few words about certain animal substances that in-

sist on making themselves heard. All animals emit peculiar odors, and if our sense of smell were keen enough we would probably be able to distinguish by it alone their different species. The animals themselves, whose scent is much keener than man's, do certainly, by this means, recognize their friends as well as their enemies, even at great distances. These odors are most probably due to essential oils, either accompanying the fixed fats or secreted by glands in the skin. Even man is not exempt from characteristic odors, for, although we accuse the poor negro of high perfumes, he returns the compliment by solemnly assuring us that he hardly perceives those of his own race, but that the odor of the white man is quite disagreeable to him. The dog not only distinguishes between men and other animals, but will track his master among thousands of other men by the infinitesimal odor passing through the sole of a shoe and left behind at each footprint; and the still more wonderful powers of the bloodhound are well known to everybody. These odors have never, as far as we are aware, been isolated or experimented with chemically, and have no direct commercial importance. It is different, however, with the animal substances referred to above. These are *ambergris*, *castoreum*, *civet*, and *musk*.

Ambregris is formed in the intestines of the sperm whale, and is believed to be a diseased product. It has been taken therefrom, but is usually found floating in the sea, on the coasts of Arabia, Japan, Madagascar, and a few other places. It is of a grayish-white color, with dark streaks, of a fatty appearance and waxy consistence. It generally occurs in small pieces, but specimens have occasionally been found, weighing from 50 to 200 pounds. It is lighter than water, is softened by the heat of the hand, melts at 140 degrees Fahrenheit, and volatilizes at higher temperatures, almost completely. Strong alcohol, ether, fixed and volatile oils, all dissolve it readily. The undiluted odor is rather too strong to be pleasant to most people, but when put up in dilute preparations it is very much esteemed. The odor is so persistent that a handkerchief scented with *ambergris* will not lose it all even when washed. It is very extensively used in the manufacture of perfumes, and was formerly employed to some extent in medicine, but the modern verdict is that, as a medicine, it is practically useless. It is somewhat expensive, having sometimes been sold as high as \$10 an ounce.

Civet is an odorous substance obtained from the civet cat, an animal ranking between the weasel and the fox, and inhabiting China, Africa, and the East and West Indies. The animals are rather shy, and so to make sure of the supply, they are kept in confinement. Civet is semiliquid, unctuous, yellowish when fresh, but becomes brown and thick when exposed to the air. It is a mixture of certain fixed oils with resins, organic salts, and the volatile oil to which it owes its strong odor. It is now used only as a perfume, though in olden times wonderful medicinal properties were ascribed to some of its preparations.

Castoreum (or *castor*).—The full Latin name of the *beaver* is *castor fiber*, whence the name of the odoriferous substance produced by him. It is an oily, viscid, heavily-scented substance, secreted by special glands.

After the death of the animal the glands are removed, and dried either by smoke or in the sun, and are then ready for the market. Two tons is a fair estimate of the annual product. The beaver of the northern and northwestern parts of America is probably of a distinct species from the Russian beaver. Both however, furnish *castor*, though the Russian is said to be by far the best. To be considered good a specimen of *castor* must have a strong, even foetid odor, and a bitter, nauseous taste. It is composed of resinous matters, albumen, mucus, salts of potassium, sodium, calcium, etc., and the essential oil which scents the whole mess. It has been used more or less ever since the days of Pliny (who treats of it), in medicine, especially in nervous diseases, hysteria and the like, but it is not used as a perfume.

Musk.—The *musk deer* is about three feet long and two feet in height, but he has no horns. His home is in the mountains, and on the high table-lands of Asia, from India to Siberia, and from the country of the Turcomans to China. The musk is contained in an oval, projecting sac, from two to three inches long, and one to two inches broad. In the full-grown animal the sac contains, on an average, about one ounce of musk, but sometimes as much as two ounces are found, though young animals yield only half an ounce. As soon as the animal is killed, the sac is secured and dried, and without further preparation, is sent into the market. Musk varies in quality with the country inhabited by the animal and the kind of food it can procure. The best is that procured in China, but the Celestials are such adepts at sophistication that it is very doubtful if any of it ever leaves the country unadulterated. A second adulteration takes place when it reaches Europe, and, not of course for the sake of filthy gain, but merely to keep up our reputation of being even with the rest of the world, we add our share to the dishonesty.

The natural product, even when not adulterated, is found to contain a host of salts of potassium, sodium, ammonium, calcium, magnesium, iron, etc., together with fixed fats, gelatine, albumen, fibrin, resin, hair, sand, etc., and finally the unknown volatile oil on which alone the value of the substance depends. The odor is strong and penetrating, and so diffusive that one ounce of musk will communicate its scent to 250 pounds of an inodorous powder, and a single grain of it will scent a room for years without losing any appreciable part of its weight.

As a medicine, taken internally, it stimulates the exhausted nerve-centers without producing any unfavorable symptoms in other directions. It has saved many a life, but it requires all the skill of the trained physician to know just when it should be administered. Its use at the hands of grand-dames and quacks is highly to be reprehended. In the manufacture of complex perfumes, it is used more perhaps than any other substance. The annual product is over 1000 pounds, and it is worth from \$50 to \$125 a pound according to the quality.

Owing to the rather high price of the true musk, the product of the American *musk rat*, and that of his cousin of India, has been used to some extent as a substitute. As far as the odor is concerned, it is hard

to find a difference, and after all, the odor is the main thing. Musk, or something closely resembling it, is secreted by a special gland in the jaw of the crocodile and of the alligator, but dental operations on these animals are not regarded as conducive to longevity.

In the *musk ox*, otherwise called *musk buffalo*, and, more appropriately still, *musk sheep*, the odorous substance pervades the whole body, rendering the flesh almost unfit for food. Of course, it cannot be collected. The *cerambix moschata* and some other insects emit, when crushed, an odor of musk, and the same is true of certain plants. Some other animals have reservoirs of odors which are not generally esteemed perfumes, but . . . something else. If it would not be thought impolite, we might mention the *badger*, the *polecat*, the *skunk*, and the festive, playful *bed-bug*; but it is time to pass on.

A FEW OF THE ESSENTIAL OILS AND THEIR PROPERTIES.

There are hundreds of essential oils, but we have space to mention only a very few even of the more important ones.

Acacia oil, commonly called *oil of cassie*, is obtained from the flowers of the *acacia farnesiana*, one of the four hundred and twenty species of the gum arabic genus. The oil, which has an extremely agreeable odor, is prepared either by expression or absorption. It is somewhat viscid, and of a greenish-yellow color. The manufacturers do not allow it to come into the market, but reserve it solely for the production of perfumes.

Almond oil (bitter) is prepared from the oil-cake left over from the manufacture of the fat oil of bitter almonds. It does not exist in the almond itself, but, together with prussic acid, is developed on the addition of water to the amygdalin of the nut. In distilling the mass, both the oil and the acid are evaporated, and then condensed in the receiver. By special chemical treatment the prussic acid, which is the most dangerous poison known, is entirely separated from the oil. The essential oil of bitter almonds, if absolutely pure, is not considered a poison, and is even used by the perfumer and the confectioner, but the safest way to use it is to have nothing to do with it. An artificial oil has been produced which is perfectly identical with the natural product; but there is another, which is only an imitation, and which resembles the true oil only by its odor; this is the nitro-benzole of the chemist; it is a rank poison.

Aniseed oil, from the seeds of the *anise* plant, is manufactured chiefly in southern Russia. When freshly prepared it is almost colorless, but it turns dark by age and loses its agreeable odor. Its taste is decidedly sweetish, but with a burning after-taste. It is chiefly used in the manufacture of liqueurs.

Bayberry oil is extracted by distillation from the leaves of the bay, or bayberry tree, which grows luxuriantly in the West Indies. There are many species of this plant, with entirely different odors, and the admixture of a small quantity of the wrong kind would entirely ruin the oil. When freshly distilled the odor is rank, but in the course of from three

to six months it becomes mellow, and ripens into the agreeable fragrance so much liked in the best specimens of bay-rum.

Bergamot oil.—The bergamot tree belongs to the orange tribe, and, just as in the case of the orange and the lemon, the oil is extracted from the rind of the fruit by the process of expression. A hundred bergamot oranges will yield about three ounces of oil. It is of a pale-green or yellowish color, becoming dark by age. The odor is simply delicious when the oil is in good condition, though if light and air be allowed to act upon it a disagreeable smell of turpentine is developed, which entirely spoils it. Besides its use in perfumery, it has been recommended as a sure cure for scabies.

Birch oil.—The bark of the common European *white birch* yields an oil which is used in the dressing of Russia leather, and which imparts to that leather its peculiar odor. It is prepared by what is called "dry distillation." The bark is placed in an earthen still having a hole in the bottom, through which the oil runs into another vessel sunk into the ground. The heat is applied by burning the wood of the tree around the upper vessel.

The *American birch*, variously called *sweet birch*, *black birch*, *cherry birch*, and *mountain mahogany*, is remarkable for the aromatic flavor of its bark and leaves, and yields an essential oil by distillation. It is largely manufactured in Schuylkill county, Pa. The first step is the gathering of the tree. Small trees, not over ten feet high, are preferred. They are cut up in a chopping machine into pieces from one to four inches long, and are then transferred to the still. Water is added, and the still is left in this condition over night. The oil does not exist, at least in any appreciable quantity, in the tree itself, but, as in the case of the almond, is formed by the reactions which take place between the water and the inodorous principles of the wood, bark, and leaves. The next day the liquid is distilled off, and the water separated from the oil by gravity. The oil is then rectified in the usual manner. Five pounds of oil from a ton of tree is considered a fair yield. This oil is very nearly related to the oil of wintergreen, for which it is largely substituted in confectionery and perfumery.

Chamomile oil.—Two varieties of chamomile oil are found in commerce, one *green* and the other *blue*. Blue chamomile is the one chiefly used in the manufacture of liquors and perfumery and in medicine. It is obtained by distillation from the flowers of the common chamomile plant. The pure oil has a beautiful blue color, and on heating gives off blue vapors. It has a penetrating odor, which does not resemble the odor of the flowers until it has been strongly diluted. By exposure to air and light it turns green, then brown, and finally is converted into a thickly-fluid brownish mass. It is frequently adulterated with oil of lemons.

Green Chamomile oil is derived from the Roman chamomile plant, which, pretending to be the only genuine article, looks down on the common kind with contempt. It possesses the pleasant odor of fresh lemons, but is used only in medicine.

Camphor and camphor oil.—There are many varieties of camphor, differing considerably in their physical properties, but they all agree in being colorless, crystalline substances, completely volatile and combustible, and in diffusing strong aromatic odors. The two kinds best known in commerce, are the Chinese, called also Japanese or laurel camphor, and the Borneo camphor. They are strictly distinct products. Laurel camphor is derived from a tree of the same name indigenous to the island of Formosa, on the coast of China. Every part of the tree contains camphor, and it is frequently found in crystalline masses between the bark and the wood, and in the pith. It is extracted by boiling the chopped wood in water. It rises to the surface and becomes solid, as the water cools. It is generally refined in Europe by sublimation, which differs from distillation only in this, that the condensed product is solid instead of liquid. This is the camphor so well known in this country and in Europe.

Borneo camphor is the product of a tree belonging to the Island of Borneo. It is highly prized as a medicine by the people of eastern Asia, and hence is much dearer than the other variety. Hence, also, it is rarely found in European or American commerce. The Chinese and Japanese are equally fond of the odor of camphor, and manage to get it into almost everything they use or export. On account of its reputed antiseptic qualities it is largely used by both Europeans and Americans in the manufacture of dentifrices, soaps, aromatic vinegars, etc. As to its medicinal properties, all that can be said is that "doctors disagree," and disagree diametrically on nearly every point concerning it. We can afford to let them have it out in their own way.

Camphor oil is likewise of two sorts, corresponding to the two camphors. The Japanese oil is obtained by distillation from the branches of the laurel camphor tree, the liquid distilled over being surrounded by cold water. The camphor itself separates out to a certain extent as a semi-solid mass, but to free it from the oil or the oil from it recourse is had to heavy pressure. The oil so obtained is called crude oil, by the re-distillation of which a "*light oil*" is collected in the receiver. This light oil has been used in the place of turpentine for the manufacture of varnishes, for which purpose it is equally as good, and it has the further advantage that it will dissolve copal and some other resins, which turpentine will not, and, lastly, it is less injurious to the health of the workmen, and it can be sold wholesale for twenty-five cents a gallon.

The *Borneo camphor oil* is procured in a different way. Incisions are made in the young trees, from which the oil flows as a thickly-fluid mass having an odor of turpentine. This is distilled to free it from a small quantity of resin which it contains, but it differs from the Japanese oil in not containing any dissolved camphor.

Caraway oil is obtained from the seeds of the caraway, so well known in this country. It is almost colorless, of a very aromatic odor and acrid taste, becoming brownish-yellow by age, and then showing an acid reaction. It is used in pharmacy as an addition to purgative medi-

cines to prevent griping, also as a scent for cheap toilet soaps and in the manufacture of liqueurs.

Cedar oil is not derived from the true cedar of Lebanon, but from a species of juniper commonly called *Virginia cedar*. It is obtained by distillation from the shavings of the wood falling off in the manufacture of lead pencils. The oil contains another oil, semi-solid, in solution, from which it is separated by a second distillation. It is a colorless, mobile fluid, but absorbs oxygen and thickens on exposure to the air. On account of its agreeable odor it is frequently used in perfumery.

Cinnamon Oils.—(a) The *genuine oil* is obtained from the *bark* of the Ceylon cinnamon tree, which grows to a height of twenty or thirty feet. The bark is steeped for several days in water and then distilled. The oil is of a pale-yellow or, when old, of a reddish-brown color and of an agreeable odor and biting but pure sweet taste.

(b) The oil from the *flowers* of the same plant closely resembles the genuine oil, but the chemist manages to find enough difference to allow him to draw a distinction.

(c) An oil is obtained from the *leaves* of the same tree entirely different from the genuine oil. It resembles the oil of cloves in taste and odor as well as in other properties.

(d) The *China cinnamon* or *Cassia* is inferior to the Ceylon, and so is the oil yielded by it. It is, however, frequently used as a substitute both in Europe and this country. The oil is extensively employed to adulterate the genuine product.

Clove Oil.—Every part of the clove-tree abounds in aromatic, essential oil, but it is most plentiful and fragrant in the unexpanded buds of the flower, and these are the cloves of commerce. To obtain the oil the buds are soaked for some time in salt water, and then submitted to distillation. The buds yield about 16 per cent. of their weight in oil. It is colorless when fresh, and has the taste and odor of the cloves to perfection.

Coriander Oil.—The coriander plant is much cultivated in Italy, where it seems to have originated. It is a singular fact that all parts of the fresh plant are highly foetid when bruised, while the fruit becomes fragrant by drying. The oil is obtained by distillation as usual. It is used in the preparation of liqueurs and perfumery soaps, and to cover the taste of unpleasant medicines.

Eucalyptus Oil.—There are at least 140 known species of eucalyptus tree, all natives of Australia, though in their own homes they are called by the more plebeian names of "gum-trees" and "string-bark trees." They constitute four-fifths of the vegetation of Australia, and are especially noted for their fever-destroying qualities. In the *Eucalyptus amygdalina* the yield of oil is very abundant, 100 pounds of leaves furnishing about 6 pounds of oil. The oil varies in color according to the species of tree, from light-yellow to pale-blue, but becomes thicker and darker by age. It has an odor resembling that of camphor, and an acrid, pungent taste. Twelve different oils, from as many different trees, are found in commerce, but they do not appear to possess the febrifuge properties of the growing tree.

Garlic oil is derived from the bulb of the garlic plant, and is especially interesting as containing sulphur. The oil does not pre-exist in the bulb, but is formed in a similar manner as bitter almond oil by a chemical process. The most simple mode of preparation is by submitting the bulbs to distillation with water. The crude oil is of a dark, brownish-yellow color, has an exceedingly pungent, garlic-like odor, and a strong, acrid taste, and when applied to the skin produces much irritation and sometimes even blisters. It is rectified by repeated distillations over a salt-water bath. The oil of garlic, taken internally in moderate doses, acts as a stimulant and as a promoter of digestion. In overdoses it is liable to occasion irritation, flatulence, hæmorrhoids, headache, and fever. Onions and leeks possess the same virtues but in a milder form.

Hop oil, though not used in perfumery, is of great importance, it being much used in breweries, especially in those working with malt extract, to give beer its characteristic aroma and also to make it *keep*. It is obtained by distillation from the flowers of the common hop. It has a pale yellow color, an acrid taste, and a strong odor of hops, and has, in a higher degree than any other essential oil, the property of checking fermentation.

Jasmine (or *jessamine*) *oil* is from the flowers of the well known jessamine plant. It is obtained by the absorption process, and is the most highly prized of all the essences. It is very scarce and proportionately dear, a fluid ounce having been sold for \$45. It has one good point however, as an offset, and that is that it cannot be imitated, nor adulterated without immediate detection.

Juniper oil is contained in all the parts, but especially in the berries, of the common juniper. It is thinly fluid, with a sweetish, turpentine-like odor and taste. It is used in medicine as a diuretic, and in preparing gin, which owes its characteristic aroma to this oil. Possibly a little too much gin is used for the same purpose, or for other purposes.

Lavender oil.—The two varieties of the lavender tree are the narrow-leaved and the broad-leaved ones. The best oil is obtained by distilling the flowers of the narrow-leaved variety, and a somewhat inferior product, by using at the same time, the stems. An acre of ground under cultivation will yield from 10 to 12 pounds of oil, which is obtained from about one ton of flowers. It is employed for the manufacture of the finest perfumes and soaps, and for costly extracts.

The broad-leaved variety grows wild and the oil, called oil of "Spike," is inferior to the true lavender oil and is much used as an adulterant.

Lemon oil is prepared by the expression process, as already described; or the rinds may be soaked in salt water and then subjected to distillation. About an ounce of oil may be had from ten good lemons. The odor of the oil is similar to that of the fresh fruit. It is used as a stimulant in medicine, and as a flavoring substance in the culinary departments of well regulated households.

Mustard oil is prepared from the seeds of the black mustard, after the fixed oil has been expressed. The oil-cake is macerated with water,

just as it is in the case of the bitter almond, and for the same reason. The pure volatile oil is transparent, and possesses in the highest degree the sharp, pungent odor of mustard. It blisters the skin, and its vapor excites tears and produces, even in small quantity, inflammation of the eyes. Diluted with sixty times its bulk of water it may, by means of a piece of cloth, be applied as a substitute for mustard-plaster, with the advantage of not making a mess.

Orange oil is obtained in the same way as the oil of lemon. In commerce it is called *oil*, or *essence of Portugal*. It is of a beautiful golden color and has a refreshing odor. It is extensively used in the manufacture of liqueurs and perfumery.

Orange-flower oil, called also *oil of neroli*, is obtained either by distillation or maceration, from the flowers of the orange, or of some of its kindred. These oils are entirely colorless when fresh, and have a peculiar burning taste, the odor, however, being delicious. They are seldom if ever, found pure in commerce.

Pennyroyal oil is distilled from the entire plant. It is pale-yellow, and has an odor of its own, which is said to be effective in driving away the musical mosquito, but we have seen that interesting animal almost taking a bath in the oil, with evident delight. It is of use in case of sick stomach, and to correct the griping effects of the more violent purgatives.

Peppermint oil is one of the few volatile oils produced on a large scale. In the United States, where the greater portion of the oil is made, there are cultivated and distilled on the average, about 15,000 tons of peppermint plants, yielding about 100,000 pounds of oil. New York, Michigan, and Ohio, are the principal places of production. In cultivation the roots are set two feet apart, and the ground is kept well hoed and clear of weeds, a very few of which in the still would impair the naturally fresh, penetrating and delicious taste of peppermint. The plants which have been exhausted are dried and used as fodder. They are preferred by cattle to any other kind of food, though they will not touch the green herb. This fact is taken advantage of by turning sheep into a field of mint in order that they may clear it of grass. The oil is sold for three or four dollars a pound, though the market is liable to be very unsteady. It is nearly colorless, or at most of a very pale-greenish color. It is employed in flavoring confectionery, perfumes, essences, and peppermint cordials. As a household medicine the world over it holds the first rank, especially for children's complaints.

Rose oil.—This oil, which is frequently called *Attar*, or *Oil of Roses*, is manufactured on a small scale in France and in England. Persia and India supply a certain quantity, but it is only in Bulgaria that it is produced on a really large scale. The flowers are distilled at a pretty high temperature, but the yield is very small. The estimates differ, though it is certain that in the most favorable conditions, it requires more than 3000 pounds of flowers to produce one pound of oil. We all know the odor of roses and the uses to which the oil may be applied. The annual product is said to be about 3000 pounds from Bulgaria alone, and this is

valued at nearly \$15,000,000. What the rest of the word produces probably no one can tell.

Turpentine oil is also called *spirits of turpentine*, and *essence of turpentine*. It is obtained from the different species of the pine tree. In this country the principal source is the common yellow, or Georgia pine. Notwithstanding the name, it is found in other states besides Georgia, as North and South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The turpentine is extracted as follows: During the fall and winter the trees are "boxed;" this means that large holes capable of holding about a gallon are made in the trees a few inches above the roots. These holes slant inwards and downwards, so as to retain the "crude" or sap, which flows into them. The "crude" is transferred to stills which hold from 12 to 20 barrels each. A barrel weighs 220 pounds, and yields about 20 per cent. of its weight of "spirits" and 60 per cent. of its weight of "rosin." The details of the manufacture would be too long to recount here, especially as we have already far exceeded the space allotted to us. Besides some slight use in medicine, turpentine is indispensable in several of the arts, and above all in the manufacture of paints and varnishes; and the consumption is enormous.

Wormwood oil is used in the manufacture of *absinthe*, and is of some interest to those who like that kind of thing; but it will never hurt the man who steers clear of it.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

Book Notices.

A STORY OF COURAGE. *Annals of the Georgetown Convent of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary. From the manuscript records. By George Parsons Lathrop and Rose Hawthorne Lathrop.* Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1894.

When two brave souls tell a story of courage, the incidents they relate must be much more vividly, because sympathetically described, than if the same tale were told by persons whose moral valor has never been put to the test. While it is no doubt true that every convert to the Church is made to face a certain amount of open, or covert sneering, for what the world regards as a mark of mental weakness, in the case of a person of prominence the sneerings, or other more substantial indications of hatred for Catholicism, are greatly increased, and therefore he, and especially she, who faces all this calmly and confesses openly submission to Rome, is clearly entitled to be called courageous.

Hence, it is peculiarly fitting that the authors of the work before us were chosen to tell of the trials and difficulties which confronted the pious and brave souls to whom is due the praise and honor of making what it is the Convent of the Visitation, at Georgetown.

From the first clause in the preface to the volume, to the last clause of the last chapter, the one prominent characteristic of the work is sympathetic, and highly intelligent, interest in the religious life. Even Montalembert himself, displays no more loving appreciation of the monastic life than do Mr. and Mrs. Lathrop.

The arrangement of the volume is excellent. The first chapter, "On the Threshold," and the second, "Introduction to the Convent," reverently introduce the reader to the very place, whose history is afterwards told, with charming simplicity and directness. One feels that not only have the authors of the volume obtained the unusual privilege of being admitted into the sacred precincts, but that they have managed to introduce with them, albeit invisibly, whoever reads their story. And just here it should be remarked that Mr. and Mrs. Lathrop are entirely just in concluding the preface with the words, "This volume is not a mere piece of editing, or a compilation, but is an original work, though following closely and accurately the authentic records from which it is derived."

To the Catholic reader, many of the details showing the contentment, as well as the obedience, of the members of the community, may seem very like proving that the sun gives light and heat; but to the non-Catholic of fair mind, the details can not fail to bring light into what he is apt to regard as a dark place. Bearing in mind that Mr. and Mrs. Lathrop know, from their own past experience, how widespread is the ignorant prejudice against the conventual system existing among non-Catholics, one feels that in telling the history of the Visitation Convent, the authors have an intense desire to make known to their former associates in religion how much the whole world owes to the unselfish and brave lives of the religious.

Owing to the limited space at the command of the reviewer, it is quite impossible to give even a brief sketch of the Order of the Visitation and its establishment in the United States. And it is well that it is so, for the

story is told so smoothly and so charmingly that it would only suffer from any attempt at abridgment.

While throughout the volume there prevails the gravity of style befitting the subject, the authors here and there introduce little incidents, for instance, that of the clock, p. 48 *et seq.*, which cause a smile. The volume has a number of excellent illustrations, the most interesting, perhaps, being the fac-simile of the original circular of the academy, at p. 138.

The completeness of the work done for the good sisters by Mr. and Mrs. Lathrop is shown by the titles of the chapters. Following the two preliminary chapters, noticed above, which serve not only to introduce the reader into the convent, but to acquaint him with the daily routine of life in the community, there is Chapter III., "The Visitation Established in the United States." The treatment of this chapter is particularly felicitous and artistic, for it opens with a prediction of Saint Francis de Sales, which was made in 1619 and which found its fulfilment in 1798, and closes with a vision granted to Father Leonard Neale, to whom the community in Georgetown owes so much.

Next comes Chapter IV., which contains a very graphic account of the foundation of the Order of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary by Saint Francis de Sales and Saint Jane de Chantal. And the story of the foundation, like that of the establishment in Georgetown, was indeed a story of courage.

Chapter V. is entitled a "Life Sketch of Saint Francis de Sales," and Chapter VI. a "Life Sketch of Saint Jane de Chantal." Here again the wise and orderly use of their material, by the authors, is shown, and there is shown, too, the advantage of having the work done by a man and a woman inspired by the same ideals, and filled with the same faith. Each of these well-named life sketches is made vivid by incidents in the career of its subject, and they glow with that fire of charity kindled only in the heart of God's saints. And not alone is charity found here, but that supernatural faith which could prompt Saint Francis to write to Saint Jane, who was beset by so many difficulties, "We should be as willing to fail as to succeed (if it be God's will)." And that other profound thought, "God makes people co-operate with Him when they are least aware of it." On one occasion, Saint Jane, who was in the City of Bruges, of which her brother was Archbishop, was extremely anxious to go to Saint Francis, in Paris, and her brother, to whom she had applied for a carriage, fearing to let her go, refused. Nothing daunted, this brave daughter of her whose visitation was her inspiration, answered the refusal with "Monsignor, obedience has good legs." The carriage was not long delayed.

But enough of these evidences of earnest devotion to work and unfaltering confidence in God might be culled from this garden of holy souls to outrun the limits of what is only meant to call attention to the work before us, and therefore we must pass on.

The next Chapter, VII., contains the "Annals of the Georgetown Convent." To any one that has ever had the happiness to be a pupil in the convent, this chapter will be full of delight; to any one that appreciates courage in the day of danger, and sweet self control in the day of adversity, it will be a source of strength and cheerfulness in his, or her, own times of trial.

To the Catholic man or woman, whose heart is warm with love for that Blessed Mother whose arms have encircled them ever since their infancy, the story of her gracious and constant care for this community, knit together in the bonds of her boundless love, will be very helpful in

keeping warm their love for her. But it will have another and special interest to the convert, to the man or woman whose early and, perchance, mature years, have passed over without a thought of her, who, in their case, has indeed proved herself to be the confounder of heresies, and who, much more than that, has proved herself to be the most tender of mothers, ever ready to heal the wounds gained in the battle of life, and it may be most tender to those who have come late to her embrace.

To the convert, this story of courage done in her honor, will afford the happiness that comes from knowing that here, in this community, is daily offered, in her service, such an abundance of loving deeds as, in a measure, to make up for the years spent by him or her in ignorance, or possibly, ignoble thoughts of her.

In conclusion, the volume, as a specimen of the bookmaker's art, is exceedingly attractive; and, irrespective of its intrinsic value, which has been very inadequately touched upon, it will be a distinct addition to any book-shelf. Especially should it be found in every Catholic library, whether public or private.

W. R. C.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, consisting of an analysis of each chapter, and of a commentary, critical, exegetical, doctrinal and moral. By the *Most Rev. Dr. MacEvilly*, Archbishop of Tuam. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. New York: Bensiger Brothers. 1895. 8vo., pp. 278.

This is the sixth volume of commentaries on the books of the New Testament from the pen of Doctor MacEvilly. He began, sometime prior to 1876, with two volumes on the Pauline and Catholic Epistles; then followed one volume on the Gospel of Sts. Matthew and Mark, one on the Gospel of St. Luke, and one on the Gospel of St. John. The volume now before us on the Acts of the Apostles completes the New Testament, with the exception of the Apocalypse.

We are glad to be able to repeat in regard to this book what a reviewer in the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY, for October, 1876, said about Doctor MacEvilly's commentary on the Gospels of St. Matthew and Mark:

... "It is unquestionably a valuable accession to English Catholic biblical literature. Archbishop MacEvilly, following the sensible practice of most Catholic commentators, concerns himself more with the kernel than the shell that encloses it; in other words, busies himself more with investigating the true meaning of the text, than with a display of verbal criticism and that far-fetched erudition which is so profusely paraded in the commentaries of heterodox and rationalist interpreters. This pompous show is simply meant to hide their emptiness and want of substance in what is most essential. Our author has quite enough of erudition and critical exegesis to satisfy not only the ordinary reader, but even the biblical student. What, however, he has principally in view is the doctrinal and moral teaching of the Sacred Books, in drawing out which he is full and at times perhaps even diffuse."

This book begins with an introduction in which the author treats briefly of the title of the Acts of the Apostles, of their author, of the time when they were written, of the place where they were written, of their language, of their canonicity and of their inspiration. In the body of the work, the Sacred Text of a chapter is given first, then follows a short analysis of the chapter, and then comes the commentary, which occupies the body of the page, while the text of each verse is printed in the margin. The work ends with an index.

The introduction is generally satisfactory, except that it omits altogether a chronological table. We think the reason given by the author for this omission is not a good one. He says that the great difference of opinion

in regard to the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles has deterred him from touching on this question. For the same reason he should abstain from trying to explain very many passages in the text about which critics differ. Commentators like Cornelius a Lapide give to us the chronology of the Acts, and they may safely be followed in this as in other parts of their works.

In the body of the work, the question of authorities is far from satisfactory. There is no list of authors or books quoted, but the surname of an author is frequently given, with not even a foot-note to tell who the man was, when he lived, what he wrote, or what value is to be attached to his opinion. For example, we frequently find Beelen quoted without a word to indicate that the author refers to John Theodore Beelen, who was professor of scripture and oriental language in the University of Louvaine, and whose exhaustive work on the literal sense of the scriptures was published in 1845. Patrizzi is also quoted without the explanation that he was a recent writer on the same subject. Again, Bloomfield is quoted without a word of caution that he was an English Protestant clergyman—Rev. S. T. Bloomfield, D.D., who, in 1832, published a Greek Testament in two vols., which contains many incorrect views of the meaning of the text. We might note other instances, but these will suffice to show that the system of quotations may be improved in future editions.

The index is a pretence. It is without exception the poorest work of its kind that we have ever seen. It contains altogether 137 entries, and no attempt has been made to sub-index, or rather the attempt has been so badly made, that its absence would have been preferable. For instance, "Adrumetum" follows "apostles," and "Agrippa" follows "Apollo." The entries are made in the most careless manner. We find the words "earthquake" and "Lydia" the only entries in connection with the visit of St. Paul to "Philippi." Even the name of the place is omitted. This is true of many other important places. "Lystra" is not mentioned. The entries bearing upon the stirring events that transpired at that place are really laughable. We have, first, "Apostles Barnabas and Paul," although in the Sacred Book Paul is always mentioned first after his visit to Cypress in the beginning of his missionary career. The next entry, referring to what took place at Lystra, is "Barnabas taken for Jupiter in Lycaonia." Not a word to indicate that St. Paul was taken for Mercury in the same place. Then follows this entry: "Rain, gift of God," which was a statement made by St. Paul at Lystra in one of his sermons. Not a word about the healing of the cripple, which led the heathen priests to mistake Paul and Barnabas for Mercury and Jupiter; not a word about the attempted sacrifice; not a word about the stoning of St. Paul. Under the heading, "St. Paul," we find this sub-entry: "Maltreatment of, p. 115." Now there is not a word in the whole chapter about St. Paul.

We have dwelt on this matter at some length, because this mean index is a blot on the book to which it is attached, and because such blots bring otherwise good books into bad repute. We are sorry to find one more fault before closing this notice. There is only one map in the book and it is marked, "The Apostle's Journeys." Many persons will know that the journeys of St. Paul are meant, but as this book is meant for the general reader, the statement should be made more clearly. On this map four journeys are marked with different colored lines, but not a word of explanation is given as to which journey was first, which second, which third and which fourth. Any one who has ever tried to trace the travels of St. Paul, even on a good map, will appreciate the difficulties

that await the student who shall try to follow the apostle of the Gentiles over this one.

We wish that the book were a translation of Cornelius a Lapide. It is a pity that Catholics have not undertaken the translation of that great master, and that such a work has been left to unfriendly hands. The writer of this notice once asked the late Monsignor Corcoran his opinion of a Lapide, and of the Oxford translation of his commentary on the Gospels. He said that a Lapide was the best of all commentators, and that the Oxford translation should be read by Catholics with caution.

We remember seeing an announcement in some foreign correspondence about a year ago, that the Jesuits had begun, some place in Europe, a complete translation of this great work, but we have not been able to verify it.

J. P. T.

GESCHICHTE DES DEUTSCHEN VOLKES. Von *Johannes Jannsen*. Culturzustände des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zum Beginn des dreissigjährigen Krieges. Viertes Buch, Ergänzt und herausgegeben von Ludwig Pastor. Band viii. Auflage 1-12. Freiburg und St. Louis, Mo. Herder. Pp. LV. 719. Pr., \$2.50.

None of the preceding portions of Jannsen's great work bears out more strikingly its claim to be a history of the German *people* than does this, its most recent volume. In the seventh volume the historian carried his readers back to the school and university life of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and pointed out the forces that wrought the intellectual status of the time. In the present volume he places us in the midst of the economical, social, moral religious life, and we see the forces at play that made for the lowest as well as for the highest conditions of German activity at the beginning and during the earlier stages of the great Revolution. We enter first into the busy scenes of commerce; follow the outgoings of trade into the surrounding states; the development of the Hanseatic League and the influence of the religious secession on that organization; the tariff system throughout the empire; the increase of bankruptcy; the spread of usurious monetary exactions, practised especially by the Jews; the hopeless confusion and deterioration of coinage; the consequent collapse, particularly of the mining industry. From the marts of commerce we enter the shop of the workingman and learn the state of the trades unions, the guilds, the tyranny of the masters, the sad condition of the journeyman and apprentice in those troubled times. From the surroundings of the artisan we are led to the farm, to the cot of the peasant, to view the wretchedness of the poor under the grinding oppression of the nobility. What a wail goes up to heaven from the downtrodden peasantry. "Could the Egyptian servitude have been greater or heavier than that which is yoked to the poor man of to-day," writes Nigrinus Hessian, superintendent in 1574. "What sighs rend the clouds! The prophet Isaias in his castigation of the lords of power aptly describes the state of our own times. But come not to Germany, my dear Isaias, and preach so strongly to the lofty and powerful, lest you go hence with bloody head, for not alone with saws, but with their very teeth would they tear you." (P. 114.)

Over against the misery of the working classes we are shown the picturing of luxury of the upper ranks of society. One turns with loathing from the scenes of revelry, debauch and all the bestiality which followed in their wake. We need not look to the new doctrine for the root and cause of the widespread corruption. They are to be found ever at work in the animal propensities of human nature; but that these propensities were given vent almost without control by the principles of the new be-

lief, is evident from the most cursory examination of their very nature, as well as by such a broad study of their practical working, as is here presented by Janssen, and especially, we might add, by his editor and continuator Pastor in his picture of the general moral-religious depravity, the material of which he has simply transferred from the confessions of the reformers themselves.

From this scene of corruption we turn to the development of witchcraft and the persecution of the witches under the new order of things. The origin of sorcery in pre-Christian times, its relation to the early German mythology, its development during the Middle Ages, its propagation during the days of so-called reform, the persecution to which sorcerers were subjected, both in Catholic and Protestant districts; all these points are developed at considerable length, the whole subject taking up about two hundred pages of the volume. And here as elsewhere throughout the work, the picture is objective. There are no exaggerations of the writer, no placing of facts in abnormal positions so as to produce effects untrue to reality. The effort throughout is plainly to set before the reader a faithful reproduction of sixteenth century life in Germany as it was, with its virtues and its vices blending as they did, and the forces, the influences that made for the one as well as for the other.

It is by this feature that Janssen has revived the Reformation days, portraying the people and their environment as they were seen and described by eye-witnesses, by those who took part in the very dramas they themselves describe and which he has simply presented to a modern public, that makes his work of such unsurpassed value for constructing a right judgment on that most momentous period of modern history. Janssen was a firm believer in the possibility of a philosophy of history. But he insisted on the philosophy coming forth from the events, not from the subjectivism, the theories and prejudices of the historian.

It is a subject for rejoicing that the work has fallen into the hands of a continuator like Dr. Pastor. Comparing the additions by the editor with the body of the original one fails to discover any difference either in minuteness of research, in breadth of erudition or in just appreciation of proportion and perspective in presentation. We trust the disciple may be given the time and strength necessary to put the crown on his master's work.

PRÆLECTIONES DOGMATICÆ QUAS IN COLLEGIO DITTON-HALL HABEBAT. *Christianus Pesch, S. J.* Tom. I, Institutiones Propædæuticæ ad Sacram Theologiam (I., De Christo Legato Divino. II., De Ecclesia Christi. III., De Locis Theologicis). Friburgi Brisgoviae. 1894. Herder. St. Louis, Mo. Pp. xiii. 403. Pr. \$2 00.

Father Pesch has a long standing claim on the gratitude of the learned world for his scholarly contributions to the "Stimmen aus Marien-Laach." He adds much to that claim by the present volume on Fundamental Theology, the first of a series intended to cover the entire field of dogmatic science. His scope in this volume carries him far beyond the mere compendium, yet not so far outward as the many tomed "Cursus Completus." He holds to the midway, aiming to furnish a work adapted to the wants of students who follow a four years' curriculum of dogmatic theology, wherein two hours are allowed for daily lectures on the study. That his work will meet this purpose he has proven by actual use in its manuscript state in his own classes.

Besides, however, the professional student of theology in seminary and university, the priest and the layman, who has mastery of its language,

will find the work helpful in enlarging and deepening their knowledge of theology. At least this will be the case with the present initial volume, which includes, in respect of timeliness, the most important parts of dogmatics, that which is generally called apologetics or fundamental theology. And this larger adaptability of the work will be in no small degree enhanced by the features which so peculiarly fit it for use in the lecture hall—its clear-cut divisions, neat propositions, well-marked headings and copious indexes.

The volume before us starts right at the roots of its subject, with an introductory chapter on the nature and division of theology in general, followed by another chapter on dogmatic theology in particular, its systematization and historical development. Apologetics is, of course, built on philosophy, whose province it is to furnish rational demonstration of the divine existence, the duty of religious worship, the possibility of revelation, the possibility and knowableness of miracles, and the obligation of embracing a special form of religious worship, provided God has, by revelation, demanded such. On these philosophical presuppositions rises the inquiry whether God has *de facto* revealed a number of truths and a line of duty concerning man's belief and conduct. This question must be solved historically in as much as revelation is viewed as a fact, and philosophically in as much as revelation is regarded as divine. The method of inquiry may proceed synthetically. Of the various revelations existing in the course of human history, one claims especial attention by reason of its universality and marvelous influence on humanity—the religion whereof Jesus Christ is the founder, objective Christianity. Are the facts narrated of the Founder of the Christian revelation historically certain, and did He stamp His message to men with the seal of divinity? The answer to this question necessitates a critical study of the sources of our Lord's history, the genuineness of the Gospel narrative, its credibility, the testimony Christ made to His own mission, the proofs He gave thereof by miracle and prophecy, by the way He provided for the propagation of His doctrine and the internal criteria He impressed upon it. This line of inquiry marks the first stage in our author's thought—on Christ as a divine messenger to men—the *Demonstratio Christiana*.

The Founder of Christianity did not communicate His message directly to the individual man. Where then is to be found the channel between Him and individual souls? Did He of a certainty establish a teaching body and endow it with power to transmit His teaching unfailingly to posterity, if so, what manner of society is that body, what its properties and visible marks, by what organs does it exercise its functions, what the range of certitude in its teaching? This indicates the second stage in our author's study—the Church of Christ—the *Demonstratio Catholica*.

The Church must prove and spread the message Christ entrusted to it by means of certain organs, which, in so far as they are informed by divine truths, are called the sources of theological doctrine, the *fontes* or *loci theologici*. The explaining and establishing of these sources or the value of tradition, the authority of the fathers and theologians, the existence and extent of inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures occupy the third and final part in the volume at hand.

From this hasty outline it will be seen that a considerable part of the work is occupied with subjects that are also treated in an introduction to the study of the Bible. It should, however, be noted that the point of view differs. Here the sacred writings are regarded in the light of simply historical documents, with the object of proving thence the origin,

nature, range and prerogatives of the Magisterium Ecclesiæ. In the introduction to Biblical study this teaching office may be presupposed as theologically proven.

Those who read this volume will certainly echo our wish that the succeeding portions of the series may come forth without delay.

F. P. S.

THE POETICAL WORKS OF LAGENIENSIS. Dublin: James Duffy & Co., Ltd. 1893. Pp. viii., 328.

All who have already had the privilege of reading any of the previous editions, whether in periodical or book form, of "The Land of Leix," "The Legend Lays of Ireland," "The Legend of Kilonan," or who have become acquainted with "Lageniensis" through his other productions, either in prose or verse, will be sure to welcome with renewed pleasure this collection of his poetical works.

Those who have not yet had this good fortune, especially those of Irish origin, who love to hear of the old tales and legends, and to learn more of the poetry and history, the biography and romance, of the land of their fathers, will find, we think, in these poems, and in the wealth of historical, biographical, and topographical notes, with which they are illustrated, a real fund of enjoyment and profit.

As most of the pieces in this collection, and some other works from the same pen, appeared originally under the *nom de plume* of "Lageniensis," that title is retained in this edition, though the author's identity has long been publicly known, and is avowed by himself in the dedication and elsewhere in the present volume. We are at liberty, therefore, to give his real name, and think we shall gratify many of our readers by stating a few facts of his personal history, which we have learned both from his books and from the information of his personal friends.

"Lageniensis" is another name for the well-known Irish and American patriot, the Very Rev. John Canon O'Hanlon, "the Irish Alban Butler," as he has been justly styled, from his *magnum opus*, "Lives of the Irish Saints," of which eight large volumes, enriched with copious and erudite notes, have already appeared. A long list of his other publications will be found appended to this volume. His literary activity and industry, involving, as they do, a great deal of careful study and research, and carried on for the most part while attending to the exacting parochial duties, at first of curate and afterwards of parish priest, in a populous Dublin parish, are indeed marvellous. It is interesting to learn that a large proportion of the poems in the present volume were composed, and some of them first published, over forty years ago in this country, where the author spent about eleven years, several of them in missionary work as a priest of the diocese of St. Louis, and two or more as professor in its theological seminary. In consequence of ill-health he returned to Ireland in 1853, where a little rest and the invigorating air of his native Laoighis (pronounced Leéish-Leix, Queen's Co.), happily effected a speedy restoration. Since then he has labored in the diocese of Dublin, where he is at present a parish priest and Canon of the Cathedral Chapter, having been appointed to this latter office by Archbishop Walsh. He is a member of the Royal Irish Academy, and has been a particular friend of his fellow academicians, the great Irish scholars, O'Donovan and O'Curry. We may add that it is mainly to his efforts that the Irish capital is indebted for the superb statue of Daniel O'Connell that graces its chief thoroughfare. His zeal overcame all obstacles and kept up the enthusiasm of the friends of the movement until the project was carried to a successful completion.

Father O'Hanlon's chief title to fame will undoubtedly be his hagiological labors. The present very acceptable volume shows indeed, we think, that he might have attained very high rank as a poet had he devoted himself to poetry as he has to biography and history; but we are glad that he has apparently given to poetry only his recreation, and bestowed his most serious labor in the cultivation of his chosen field, the "Lives of the Irish Saints."

Of this great work, four volumes (September to December) remain yet to be completed. We do not know how far he has advanced in the preparation of his materials, but trust that, notwithstanding his already advanced age he will be able to command the time and labor necessary to finish the work, and sincerely hope that he may be spared to see its happy completion.

THE GAELIC JOURNAL. (Vol. v., Dublin, 1894.)

We have received the opening numbers of vol. v. of this "Journal," which is a monthly publication devoted to the study of the Irish language and literature. Whether the present efforts to perpetuate the use of Irish as a spoken idiom be successful or not, it is manifestly of great importance to students of all branches of the old Celtic tongue, and to philologists generally, that as many as possible of its words and phrases be recorded and their meaning ascertained and placed beyond doubt, and within the reach of scholars, while it is still possible to do so. In this work, as well as in other respects, the Journal is evidently doing good service. In its issue for June last we find the following paragraph: "Some people are anxious to know why we publish folk-stories. It is not so much for their value as folk-lore as for the number of old words not to be found in dictionaries, which they contain. We would venture to say that each of the recent issues of the Journal contains over a score of ancient Gaelic words which are now put on record, translated and explained for the first time. It is only by continuing to collect in this way that we can obtain the materials for a good, modern Irish dictionary."

In the same number we find an article on the "Ancient Irish Divisions of the Year," which, it seems to us, furnishes a good example of solid, scientific work, and shows what progress it is possible to make in Celtic philology and antiquities beyond what has been accomplished even by such masters in this department as Drs. O'Connor and O'Donovan.

The "Gaelic Journal" is published at the expense of its editor, Rev. Eugene O'Growney, M.R.I.A., Maynooth College, Ireland, to whom all communications (including subscriptions) should be addressed. The subscription is 6s. (\$1.50) a year, and all but a few of the back numbers are still procurable.

LIFE OF BLESSED JOHN GABRIEL PERBOYRE, Priest of the Congregation of the Mission. Martyred in China, September 11, 1840. Translated from the French. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1894.

Had China, in her day of grace, accepted the good tidings offered to her time and again by a long series of zealous apostles, she would not now be presenting to the world an unparalleled example of the rigor of divine vengeance. But she chose to close her ears to the heavenly message. Her soil is drunk with the blood of saints. Together with the faith, she refused to accept the civilization of Christianity. The consequence is a total collapse of her colossal power.

The present volume narrates, in language of touching simplicity, the virtuous life and cruel martyrdom of a missionary of the current century. The story opens "amid the fertile vine-clad hills of France," where Blessed John Gabriel was born, in 1802, and after a rapid sketch of the childhood, education, religious vocation, novitiate, and early priestly labors of the future martyr, carries us to the extreme East, where, chiefly in the saint's own pathetic utterances, it gives a graphic description of missionary struggles in the very centre of the vast pagan empire. It is impossible to read the narrative of the saint's exquisite sufferings and terrible martyrdom without the deepest feeling of sympathy, mingled with intense admiration, for that faith which renews in our own generation the triumphs of the early days. It is a story which should be told to children and adults in school and church.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE STUDENT'S HANDBOOK OF BRITISH AND AMERICAN LITERATURE. By *Rev. O. L. Jenkins, A.M., S.S.* Edited by *Rev. G. E. Viger, A.M., S.S.* Eighth edition. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.

LET US GO TO THE HOLY TABLE. By *Rev. J. M. Lambert*, of the Congregation of the Most Holy Sacrament. Second edition. New York: Benziger Brothers. 30 cents net.

THE CATHOLIC GIRL IN THE WORLD. By *Whyte Aves*, with a preface by Very Rev. R. F. Clarke, S. J. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUE DEVOTION. From the French of *Rev. J. N. Gron, S. J.* By *Rev. A. Clinton, S. J.* New York: Benziger Brothers.

LEGENDS AND STORIES OF THE HOLY CHILD JESUS FROM MANY LANDS. By *A. Fowler Lutz*. New York: Benziger Brothers. Price, \$1.00.

A HISTORY OF THE MASS. By *Rev. John O'Brien, A.M.* Fifteenth edition. New York, etc.: Benziger Brothers. \$1.25 net.

THE FLOWER OF THE FLOCK AND THE BADGERS OF BELMONT. By *Maurice F. Egan*. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LIFE OF MARY MONHOLLAND, One of the Pioneer Sisters of the Order of Mercy in the West. Chicago: Hyland & Co.

JESUS THE GOOD SHEPHERD. By *Right Rev. L. De Goesbriand, D.D.* New York: Benziger Brothers. 75 cents net.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES. By *Dr. J. M. Rice*. New York: Century Co.

THE LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR. By *Mrs. Abel Ram*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

MOSTLY BOYS. Short stories. By *Francis J. Finn, S. J.* New York: Benziger Brothers.

70952

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

